DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 663 HE 011 473

AUTHOR	Brown, Sylvia J.; Wilson, James W.
TITLE	National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training.
INSTITUTION	Northeastern Univ., Boston, Mass. Cooperative Education Research Center.
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	199p.; Parts of appendix may not reproduce clearly
AVAILABLE FROM	Cooperative Education Research Center, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Cooperative Education; Cooperative Programs; Cost Effectiveness; Experiential Learning; *Faculty Development; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; Government Role; Higher Education; Instructional Innovation; Program Development; School Industry Relationship; *Work Experience Programs; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Office of Education; Outcomes of Education

ABSTRACT

An in-depth assessment of cooperative (co-op) education training programs is presented. For the purposes of this research, cooperative education is defined as work and school experiences designed to complement each other. Five questions are addressed: (1) Are the training programs teaching the right things? (2) Is the training being done competently? (3) What are the outcomes of training? (4) Is training reaching the people who need it? and (5) What does training cost? Data were collected from the training directors of 16 workshops that were funded by federal grants to improve instruction in cooperative education. Questionnaires were also completed by training program participants, training program faculty, employers of co-op students, and co-op personnel who had never participated in training programs. Results indicate that: co-op education training workshops should concentrate on participant outcomes and learning objectives, the workshop faculty are competent, and more workshops for experienced co-op educators should be offered. Significant outcomes of the workshops included: a better understanding of the role of the co-op coordinator, knowledge of the benefits of co-op for employers, opportunities to meet with colleagues involved in co-op education, and increased knowledge of the relationship of co-op education to career education. Recommendations for pre-workshop needs assessment, the workshop program, and post-workshop activities are provided as well as general recommendations and ideas on the role of the U.S. Office of Education in co-op education. The survey instruments and tabulated results are appended. (BH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
[illegible]

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Sylvia J. Brown
James W. Wilson

Cooperative Education Research Center
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

HE 011 473

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT
OF
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION TRAINING

by

Sylvia J. Brown
and
James W. Wilson
Cooperative Education Research Center
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts

Copyright © 1979 by the Cooperative Education Research Center
Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115
All Rights Reserved

PREFACE

In September of 1978, the results of the national assessment of cooperative education training were presented to training directors and the Chief of the Cooperative Education Branch of the U.S. Office of Education, at a conference held by the Cooperative Education Research Center. This is the formal report of the results presented orally at the September conference. The purpose of this report is to present the procedures and findings of the national assessment of cooperative education training programs and to offer recommendations for strengthening training in cooperative education. The project was supported by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (OEG 007702530). The Cooperative Education Research Center hopes the report will be useful to the U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Education Branch staff as well as to cooperative education trainers, and, ultimately, those who will be participants in co-op training programs.

There are a number of people whose assistance in this national assessment was invaluable. Peter Azar, a Northeastern University Graduate Assistant, was responsible for organizing the considerable amount of data that was gathered as well as for completing numerous other data-related tasks. His diligence, patience, and good nature are greatly appreciated. The mailing and coding of over 1,000 questionnaires could not have been accomplished without the help of a number of students: Delores Ciaccia, Sarah DiGeronimo, Cathleen Donnellan, Lori Girshick, Steve Grabon, Barbara Johnson, Tim McGuiness, Willie Miller, Ellen O'Brien, and Jenny Pollak. The members of the Cooperative Education Research Center between 1977 and 1978--G. Ruth Bork, Donna Ciaccia, Diane Kemski, Etsuko Kumai, Ken Stockton, and Cynthia Whitten--

offered numerous constructive suggestions which have contributed to this final report. We are particularly grateful to Cynthia Whitten who did all the computer programming for this study. Mary Lou Elias deserves a special thank you for her excellent work in preparing the final manuscript. To all the training directors, workshop participants and instructors, and other cooperative educators who were so generous with their time--a sincere thank you for your cooperation.

We are pleased to have this opportunity to thank all those persons who either contributed data or helped to collect and analyze it. This assessment was completed, in large part, because of their efforts. The Research Center, however, assumes full responsibility for the substance of this report.

Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts
April, 1979

Sylvia J. Brown
James W. Wilson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

CHAPTER
I INTRODUCTION 1
- Need for Assessment 1
- Assessment Objectives 1
- Outcomes of Assessment 3

CHAPTER
II ASSESSMENT DESIGN 4
- Sample of Training Center 4
- Data Collection 4
- Questionnaire and Interview Guide Design 5
- Sampling 9

CHAPTER
III ASSESSMENT RESULTS 14
- Method of Data Analysis 14
- Training Center Data 15
- Participant Questionnaire Results 19
- Non-Participant Questionnaire Results 32
- Faculty Questionnaire Results 34
- Employer Results 39
- Interviews with Training Directors 42
- Cost Data 47

CHAPTER
IV CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 49
- Are the Right Things Being Taught? 49
- Is the Training Being Competently Done? 51
- What are the Outcomes of Training? 53
- Is Training Reaching the People Who Need It? 54
- What Does Training Cost? 55
- Recommendations 55

APPENDICES
A Follow-up Letter to Training Directors 64

B Participant Questionnaire 67

C Faculty Questionnaire 81

D Employer Questionnaire 89

E Non-Participant Questionnaire 92

F Training Director Interview Guide 99

G U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Education Branch Interview Guide 104

H Tables of Data from Mailed Questionnaires 106
- Participant Tables 107
- Non-Participant Tables 142
- Faculty Tables 153
- Employer Tables 167

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDICES (continued)

I Results of Training Director Interviews 169

J Resources on Training 192

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Need for Assessment

The national assessment of cooperative education training was conceived and planned in 1976. In the period between 1970 and 1976, 62 grants totalling $1,891,000 were awarded by yhe U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Education Branch under Title IV-D and Title VIII for programs to train cooperative education personnel, auxillary personnel, and employers. Individual funded programs ranged from one-day conferences to acquaint prospective employers with the merits of cooperative education to comprehensive four week graduate level courses. Most, however, were three or four day programs to either introduce new personnel to cooperative education or to update personnel already in the field.

At the conclusion of each grant period, the grantees had presumably submitted to the Division of Training and Facilities progress reports which would include self-appraisal statements. There had not, however, been any systematic, in-depth or independent evaluation of training supported under Title IV-D or Title VIII. Further, the national assessment of cooperative education, conducted by Applied Management Sciences, did not include an examination of co-op training programs. Given the absence of any formal evaluation to guide further planning and the reasonable possibility that funding for training would continue to be available over the next few years, it appeared to be a particularly appropriate time to undertake a thorough assessment of cooperative education training programs.

Assessment Objectives

The research sought answers to five important questions. These questions as well as the specific issues subsumed under them are as follows:

1. Are the right things being taught?

   - What are the objectives of training programs?

   - What are the substantive topics of training programs?

   - What are the training needs as perceived by

     a. participants in training programs
     b. training program directors
     c. employers
     d. staff of Cooperative Education Branch, Office of Education

   - What relationships exist between the stated objectives and the content of training programs?

   - What relationships exist between objectives, content and expressed training needs?

   - How are training program objectives and curriculum content determined?

   - Is there specialization among the training centers?

2. Is the training being competently done?

   - What is the background of the training faculties and consultants?

   - What is participant appraisal of the training effectiveness of the faculties and consultants?

   - What training materials are available to the participants?

   - What teaching methods are used?

   - What are the training sites and facilities like?

3. What are the outcomes of training?

   - What are the major learning outcomes as perceived by the participants? To what extent do these learning outcomes relate to perceived training needs?

   - In what ways has training impacted upon the participants' cooperative education programs?

4. Is training reaching the people who need it?

   - How and to whom are the training programs made known?

   - Why do some people choose not to attend training programs?

5. What does training cost?

  - What is the cost of training facilities?
  - What is the cost of room and board?
  - What is the cost of faculties and consultants?
  - What is the cost of program announcement?
  - What is the cost of associated travel?
  - What are training costs per participant per training day?

Outcomes of Assessment

It was believed that detailed answers to the above questions would provide a sound empirical base to:

- Determine overall effectiveness of training efforts.
- Determine differential effectiveness of various approaches to training.
- Determine cost effectiveness of training.
- Assess the impact of training on the development of cooperative education programs.
- Suggest ways, if warranted, to increase training effectiveness.
- Assist the Cooperative Education Branch to determine the efficacy of its funding criteria for training and, if appropriate, provide recommendations for revision.

CHAPTER TWO

ASSESSMENT DESIGN

Sample of Training Centers

The assessment was begun in September of 1977. The assessment design called for an evaluation of those training programs conducted during the two-year period just prior to the commencement of this study. The two-year limitation was adopted because it was assumed that people would not clearly remember a one-to-four-day workshop which took place more than two years earlier. Three training centers were eliminated from the sample since they received grants in 1975 only and did not apply for grants again in subsequent years. The final sample thus included 16 training centers which had received grants in fiscal year 1975-1976 and/or 1976-1977.

Each of the training directors of the 16 programs was contacted by telephone. The purpose of the study was explained and participation of the training center requested. In each case the training director agreed to participate in the study. A follow-up letter was then sent to each director and in that letter the objectives of the study were re-stated and the specific types of data needed by the Research Center were itemized. A copy of that letter appears as Appendix A.

Data Collection

Two general types of data were collected. First, data applicable to each workshop conducted during the two-year period were requested from the training centers directly, including:

- Announcements
- Audience to whom workshop addressed

- Objectives
- Curriculum topics
- Hand-out materials
- Summaries of participant evaluations
- Direct costs incurred by Center
- Participant rosters
- Faculty rosters

The first seven items above were used to provide insight into each center's conception of who should be trained and how training should proceed. Viewed from a broader perspective, these data also provided information on the direction co-op training had taken in recent years.

Second, additional data were collected by sending questionnaires to or conducting interviews with various personnel involved in cooperative education training. Questionnaires were developed and sent to training program participants, training program faculty, employers of co-op students, and co-op personnel who had never participated in training programs. Interview guides were developed and used in telephone interviews with training program directors and staff members of the Cooperative Education Branch of U.S. Office of Education.

Questionnaire and Interview Guide Design

Participant Questionnaire

This instrument was designed to assess the training needs and satisfaction of workshop participants. Participants were first asked about pre-arrival matters such as: reasons for attending a training program; methods of being notified about a workshop; and types of information participants received prior to their arrival at the workshop. The next set of questions focused on the training program itself including: evaluation of the faculty and their instructional techniques; use of and preference for subgroupings; assessment of workshop content, outcomes, and impacts; overall assessment of the training program. Participants were then asked to assess various aspects of the learning environment of the workshop. Finally, demographic data was requested in order to describe the sample of respondents as well as to permit subsequent statistical cross-tabulations. A copy of the full questionnaire appears as Appendix B.

Faculty Questionnaire

The main purposes of the faculty questionnaire were to assess the relevancy and effectiveness of particular training programs in terms of meeting participant needs as well as to identify current training needs in general. Faculty were first asked about pre-arrival matters including lead time, information received prior to the workshop, and clarity of assignment. The next series of questions were about the training program itself, such as instructional approaches used, faculty learning objectives, perceptions of the relevance of the workshop sessions and the effectiveness of the workshop sessions, assessment of the overall quality of the workshop, views on subgrouping, and extent that faculty qualifications were relevant to the tasks and goals to be accomplished. The third section asked for an assessment of the learning environment. Faculty were then asked to provide an overall assessment of the quality of and need for co-op training programs. Finally, two demographic items were included in order to better understand the background of the faculty. A copy of the faculty questionnaire appears as Appendix C.

Employer Questionnaire

In order to identify those training topics which co-op employers believed would strengthen employer/co-op program interactions, a third research instrument was designed. A series of 14 possible training topics were listed and the employer was asked to rank each topic as being "very important", "somewhat important", or "not at all important" to the employer/college relationship. Employers were also asked to assess how adequately co-op training had been meeting their needs.

A copy of the employer questionnaire appears as Appendix D. This instrument was deliberately brief in order to encourage employer responses.

Non-Participant Questionnaire

One of the objectives of the assessment of training was to determine whether cooperative education training has been reaching those people who need or want it and to learn why some people choose not to participate in training. Hence, a questionnaire was designed to gather these types of data from a group of co-op educators identified as non-participants in training activities.

Non-participants were first asked to indicate why they have never attended a training program. Then they were asked how they obtained certain information and skills that are commonly perceived as outcomes of co-op training. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate which topics would be of interest to them if they chose to attend a training program. Demographic items were included at the end of the questionnaire in order to describe the sample of respondents. A copy of the non-participant questionnaire appears as Appendix E.

Field Testing of Questionnaires

Each of the four questionnaires was field tested. Samples of participants, faculty, employers, and non-participants were asked to complete and comment upon the appropriate questionnaires. Specifically, respondents were asked to: estimate how long it took to complete the questionnaire; to indicate which, if any, questions were ambiguous or irrelevant; to write in any additional comments on the format or content of the questionnaire. The responses were analyzed to determine which questions on each questionnaire were presenting difficulties. Revisions were made wherever necessary and final versions of the questionnaires were prepared.

Training Director Interview Guide

A structured interview guide was developed in order to obtain a standard set of information from each training director during an approximately half-hour telephone interview. Training directors were asked to describe their own training programs as well as their perceptions of the role of the federal government in co-op training and of future directions and roles of co-op training. The specific questions that were asked are listed in Appendix F.

Staff, Cooperative Education Branch, U.S.O.E., Interview Guide

The purpose of the telephone interviews with the Cooperative Education Branch staff was to determine their perception of co-op training needs and the extent to which those needs have been met. The role of the federal government in the training process, particularly grant application and funding procedures, was also examined. As with the training directors, a structured interview guide was developed to facilitate telephone interviews. A copy of that guide appears in Appendix G.

Sampling

Participants

Questionnaires were sent to all training program participants who were listed on workshop rosters for the two-year period being studied.[1] In all, 4,090 questionnaires were mailed with two follow-ups. A final response rate of 52 percent was received. However, a useable response rate of 40 percent was achieved. For a number of reasons, 12 percent of the participant population questionnaires were returned but were unuseable: six percent were returned blank because the addressee was no longer at the institution; three percent were returned by the addressee, asserting they had not attended the workshop in question; one percent asserted they could not remember events well enough to complete the questionnaire; and two percent simply refused to complete the questionnaire. Hence, the findings of this research concerning participant perceptions are based upon completed questionnaires from 1,652 workshop attendees.

It is interesting to note that the range of response rate among training centers was considerable. For one training center, only 18 percent of the questionnaires were returned in a useable form; for another, 70 percent of the questionnaires were returned completed. This discrepancy is partially explained by the fact that certain participant groups, such as employers and top college administrators, are less likely to complete long questionnaires than are other groups. The mean rate of return of useable questionnaires was 44 percent.

---

[1] If a person attended more than one training program during the year, they were sent only one questionnaire. The criterion for deciding which training program the participant was to evaluate was the number of participants in each training program. For instance, if the person attended one workshop with only 10 other participants and another with 30, then he was sent a questionnaire for the smaller workshop.

This number of respondents was sufficient to provide a reliable analysis of participant views of training.

The data of Table 1 show that the proportions of various groups of workshop attendees in the final research sample are very similar to those of the population. This is taken as positive evidence that the research sample is representative of the population of participants.

TABLE 1

Comparison of Sample and Population
Job Titles - Participants

	Sample	Population
Types of		
College personnel	77%	74%
Employers	10	17
High school	10	6
Other (i.e., federal agency)	3	2

Faculty

"Faculty" are those people who either taught a session or appeared as a member of a panel at a training workshop. Questionnaires were sent to 432 faculty of training programs which is the total population of workshop faculty for 1975-76 and 1976-77. As was the case for the participant questionnaire, people who taught at more than one workshop received only one questionnaire. Forty-six percent of the faculty responded to the questionnaire after the initial mailing and two follow-ups. Another 13 percent of the questionnaires were returned but not completed because the individuals were no longer at the institution, reported they did not attend the program, or did not remember enough to adequately complete the form. It is reasonable to assume that the responses of 200 persons providing workshop instruction will give a clear picture of their views and concerns.

Employer

In order to assess perceived training needs from the co-op employers point of view, questionnaires were sent to all employers who belonged in 1977 to either the Cooperative Education Association or the Cooperative Education Division of the American Society for Engineering Education. The assumption was made that employers who were interested enough in cooperative education to join a professional co-op organization were most likely to be knowledgeable and concerned enough to respond to a brief questionnaire on co-op training. Analysis of questionnaire returns after two follow-ups shows that 60 percent of the 262 questionnaires were completed and returned and another three percent were returned blank because the addressee was not available to complete the questionnaire.

Non-participants

One of the study objectives was to assess whether training in co-op has been reaching the people who need it and to learn the reasons people have for choosing not to attend training sessions. Hence, an attempt was made to find a group of people who had never attended training programs and to have this group complete a non-participant questionnaire. The method for selecting this group was as follows. First, a pool of potential participants of training programs was identified. This group was then compared to the rosters of actual participants which had been received from the training directors. The assumption was made that if the person was not on the lists of co-op training center participants we received, then at least for the two-year being studied, they would not have attended a training program. The decision was made to use the 1975 Cooperative Education Association (C.E.A.) membership directory to identify the potential non-participants.

A questionnaire was thus sent to the 385 people taken from the C.E.A. membership list who had not participated in training during 1975-1977 period. The first question on the non-participant questionnaire asked whether the person had participated in training either prior to or subsequent to the two-year period under study. In fact, of the 155 questionnares that were returned, 71 respondents indicated that they had attended a training program during a period of time not included in this study. Only 42 persons, or 11 percent of the 385 questionnaires mailed had nvever participated in a training program.

Characteristics of non-participants were compared with those of participants. As an examination of Table 2 reveals, these two groups differ in a number of interesting though not surprising ways. The non-participant group included a higher proportion of persons who have been in co-op for at least three years as well as a higher ratio of employers to junior college people. These differences may be partially expalined by the bias involved in using the 1975 C.E.A. membership list to obtain the non-participant sample. Thirty percent of the C.E.A. membership at that time was made up of co-op employers, many of whom were the larger employers who had been involved in cooperative education for a number of years. The discrepencies may also reflect the fact that employers and those who have considerable experience in cooperative education are less likely to desire co-op training and, therefore, more apt to be non-participants.

TABLE 2

Comparison of Characteristics of Participants and Non-Participants

	Participants	Non-Participants
Length of time in co-op		
0-6 months	27%	2%
7 months-1 year	14	10
13 months-3 years	18	24
More than 3 years	16	57
Not directly involved in co-op	26	5
Type of institution		
Co-op employer	10%	40%
Senior college or university	41	38
Junior or community college	36	19
High school	10	2
Other	3	2

CHAPTER THREE

EVALUATION RESULTS

Method of Data Analysis

All useable questionnaires were coded, keypunched, and cross-checked for accuracy in preparation for computer analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program was used to run a simple frequency analysis of responses for each item.[1] These data served as the main basis for analysis.

Whenever a potentially significant relationship between two variables was suspected, such as between "participant assessment of the value of the workshop" and "participant rating of the workshop's responsiveness to their needs", a cross-tabulation was done. Two statistical tests were performed on the resultant cross-tabs: the chi-square (X^2) statistic, in order to determine the statistical significance of the relationship and the lambda (λ) statistic, as a measure of predictive association.

Data resulting from the mailed questionnaires are summarized in tables which appear in Appendix H. The body of the report will discuss findings and will present only those tables of results which are essential to the discussion.

Other data collected during the study were analyzed in ways appropriate to those data. For example, the statements of workshop objectives were analyzed qualitatively. They were studied, categorized, and critiqued in terms of principles associated with the preparation of educational objectives.[2] The analytic approach used for these data is described when they are presented and discussed.

---

[1] Norman H. Nie, et.al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975).

[2] Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain, (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956).

Training Center Data

In order to understand how co-op training was functioning during the period being studied, the Research Center collected the following data for each workshop sponsored by each training center: announcements; audience; objectives; curriculum topics; hand-outs; and summary of participants' evaluations. These materials were used to provide an overview of co-op training.

Location of Training Centers

Between 1975 and 1977, the majority of the training centers were located in the Eastern part of the country and only three were located in the Southwest or West. As training needs changed and as more training proposals were developed by co-op educators in the Southwest and West, the geographic distribution of training centers shifted. Currently (1978), there are seven training centers in the western part of the country as compared to three in 1977. Approximately eight percent of the participants of training workshops during the period being studied were from regions seven and eight which at that time did not have their own regional training centers.[3] Participants from these regions either traveled to workshops held at the larger training centers or went to locally held workshops co-sponsored by centers based in other geographic regions.

Average Number of Workshops Per Year

For both of the fiscal years under study, an average of six workshops a year were held by each center. The range of workshops was from one to 14 a year.

---

[3] Regions seven and eight include Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, North and South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

These extremes are indicative of two different approaches to training. Some centers worked with a few selected colleges. They usually held no more than two or three formal workshops a year with very comprehensive follow-up and consulting activities scheduled for each participating college. On the other hand, some centers tried to reach as many people as possible and to cover a wide range of topics. These centers thus offered between ten and fourteen workshops and endeavored to meet a variety of training needs.

Training Topics

The topics presented at co-op workshops varied from one training center to another. The most frequently included topics related to the needs and roles of the college co-op coordinators and directors. The second most frequently reported topics pertained to the benefits of cooperative education for employers.

A smaller percentage of workshops addressed the general informational needs of groups who were interested in learning more about co-op although they were not directly involved in it, such as high school counselors and college faculty and administrators. There were a variety of other more specific topics geared to meeting the needs of particular groups within co-op, such as support personnel or program evaluators.

Training Objectives

Training directors were asked to provide the objectives for each of their workshop sessions and in most cases did. In those instances where objectives were not specified, they were inferred from the announcement, the agenda or other workshop literature. Examination of the objectives proved to be most enlightening. The following are examples of those objectives stated most frequently: "*to explain* the nature and characteristics of cooperative education"; "*to educate* participants with regard to the benefits of cooperative education"; "*to describe* the role of various participants in cooperative education, i.e., the coordinator, the employer, the faculty"; "*to generate* increased interest in or *gain* support for cooperative education"; "*to present* assessment and evaluation techniques for co-op programs."

There are two observations that can be made regarding these training objectives. First, the objectives are often very general and thus not easily evaluated. Second, and of critical importance, these objectives are worded in terms of what the training program is going to do: it will "*present*, "*educate*" and "*explain.*" The objectives are not stated in terms of what the participant will gain, such as "the participant *will be able to use a learning contract.*" In fact, co-op training objectives, as they have been stated, are not proper learning objectives.

There is clearly a strong orientation in co-op training towards imparting information rather than developing and assessing skills. The main point to be made here, however, is that whether the trainer is emphasizing acquisition of skill or knowledge, the focus has been on the process of training rather than on the hoped-for participant outcomes.

Hand-Out Materials

The Research Center requested copies of all hand-outs used by each training center. The materials received included: lists of selected co-op literature; brochures and forms used in individual co-op programs; and instructional materials designed by the training center. Some training centers used resource tables to display and offer a variety of brochures, forms and other materials from many co-op programs across the country. Two observations can be made about hand-out materials:

- There was great diversity among the training centers in materials used.
- Most hand-outs were informational pieces rather than skill-development exercises.

Participant Characteristics

Fifty-five percent of the workshops studied had between 31 and 40 attendees and twelve percent had over 60 participants. Three-fourths of the people who attended workshops were college personnel. The next largest group of attendees was comprised of co-op employers. This group accounted for 17 percent of the total sample. Six percent of the participants were people from high schools or junior high schools. In addition, a few college and high school students and persons from state and federal agencies attended training sessions.

Summary of Participant Evaluation

In order to learn the participants' view of co-op training prior to our own questionnaire evaluation, the written evaluations that participants gave trainers immediately following each individual workshop were collected, studied, and summarized. Almost 90 percent of the attendees who completed the written evaluations, rated their workshops as either good or excellent.[4]

From the 80 workshops for which evaluation information was available, the most frequent evaluative comments were extracted and the following conclusions were drawn:

- Participants were favorably impressed when there were adequate question and answer periods, good hand-outs and employer and student panels.
- In many cases, the workshop leadership received praise.

---

[4] It should be noted that for 66 workshops, no evaluation data were made available to the Research Center.

- Criticisms occurred when there was inadequate time for question and answer sessions and when participants wanted more specific information than they received.
- Some participants felt that separate meetings and training for particular subgroups, such as two year college personnel, were desirable.

Examination of the evaluation forms used by co-op trainers reveals an interesting pattern. Almost all of the forms ask participants to rate the workshop sessions and/or presenters on a scale from "poor to excellent" or "very satisfied to very dissatisfied". Some ask for strengths and weaknesses and many request suggestions for improvement. None, however, try to determine what the participants have actually learned or whether their specific needs have been met. The approach taken toward evaluation is consistent with that used in stating training objectives. In both instances, co-op training is oriented toward what the program is doing and not toward what participants are achieving.

Participant Questionnaire Results

Thirty percent of participants responding to the "Participant Questionnaire" were either co-op coordinators or directors; 16 percent were college administrators; eleven percent were teaching faculty; eight percent were employers of co-op students; and seven percent were high school counselors. The remaining 28 percent of the respondents were other college personnel or persons interested in co-op but employed outside a co-op college setting.

Twenty-six percent of the participant questionnaire respondents had not worked directly in the field of co-op. This group included high school counselors, persons from outside agencies, and college personnel with an interest in co-op but no experience in that field. Forty-one percent of the people who attended workshops had worked in co-op for less than one year. Only 16 percent of the respondents reported they had been involved in co-op for more than three years.

Pre-Arrival Matters

All participants were asked to respond to a list of reasons people might have for attending co-op training programs. They were asked to indicate whether each reason did or did not apply to them in their decision to select the particular training program they attended. The most frequently given reason (85%) for attending a workshop was the opportunity to meet with other persons in cooperative education. The importance of opportunities to affiliate with colleagues may be further seen by the fact that 47 percent of the 58 persons who wrote in additional reasons for attending stated they went to the workshop in order to "exchange ideas and information with others in the field of co-op". Other reasons given by over 75 percent of the respondents were as follows:

- to learn about the roles of the co-op coordinator and the co-op employer
- to learn the requirements for developing a viable program
- to understand the relationship between cooperative education and career education
- to learn to do program evaluation
- to know the benefits of co-op for employers

Additional reasons for attending training programs appear in Table 3.

It is interesting to note that the reasons for participating in training vary somewhat from center to center. For example, at one training center only 38 percent of the trainees were interested in learning about the merits of cooperative education for minority students, whereas at another training center 83 percent of the participants expressed this as a reason for attending the training workshop. Generally, of course, participants' reasons for attending a particular workshop are consistent with the goals and plans of that training program. There are some topics, however, that most participants

TABLE 3
Reasons for Participating in Training Programs

Contact with people in co-op	85%
Role of co-op coordinator	81
Requirements for developing a viable program	80
Role of co-op employer	79
Relationship of co-op to career education	78
Program evaluation	76
Benefits of co-op for employers	76
Concept of cooperative education	74
Plans/goals of new program	73
Issues related to implementation	69
Techniques of student recruitement	68
Student counseling	67
Evaluation of student learning	66
Costs of a co-op program	65
Job development	61
Selling co-op to faculty	60
Role of co-op in the liberal arts	56
Running an efficient co-op office	55
Development of learning contracts	53
Merits of co-op for minorities	53
Public relations techniques	52
Selling co-op to top administrators	50
Writing a grant proposal	45
Professional societies in co-op	41
History of co-op	39

expressed interest in no matter which workshop they attended. Topics such as the "concept of cooperative education" and "costs of co-op programs" have broad applicability and almost universal appeal.

Respondents were asked to give the reasons they selected the particular workshop they went to. The majority indicated that relevant workshop topics were of primary importance but convenient location was also a significant factor. Convenient location was found to be especially important for some types of workshop participants, e.g., high school counselors, employers, and two-year college personnel.

Exactly two-thirds of the participants reported they first heard about the workshop through an announcement sent by the workshop sponsor. Others learned about workshops through the recommendation of either a colleague or supervisor or by reading about the workshop in the Hotline on Co-op Training.[5]

Participants were asked if they had received certain types of information prior to their arrival at the workshop. Ninety percent of the respondents reported they received information on the purpose and content of the workshop; 86 percent reported they received cost information; 80 percent said they received information on the leadership; 77 percent received information on accommodations. Fewer than half of the respondents remembered receiving information on travel arrangements or on social and recreational opportunities in the general area. In many instances, however, information on accommodations, travel arrangements, or social opportunities was not relevant since the workshop lasted only one day and participants commuted to the workshop site for that day.

Workshop Faculty

Overall, the faculty were viewed quite favorably by participants. As the data in Table 4 show, virtually all of the respondents felt the workshop instructors were clear in their presentations and responded to questions well. Although most participants reported that faculty were available for discussion and consultation, ten percent indicated faculty were not particularly accessible. This finding is of some concern since one of the main reasons participants attend training programs is to meet with other people in cooperative education.

Approximately two-thirds of the respondents reported that instructors took a flexible and balanced postition towards differing approaches to cooperative education. This means, of course, that one-third of the participants felt that faculty demonstrated some bias toward one approach to co-op. In many cases, participants thought the bias was toward the co-op model used at the college in which the training center was housed.

---

[5] George H. Miller, ed., Hotline on Co-op Training, (Tampa, Florida: Southeastern Center for Cooperative Education, quarterly publication)

When asked to provide a generalized assessment of teaching staff and workshop leadership, 67 percent of the respondents indicated that all or almost all of the instructors were good and 26 percent thought that most were good but a few were inadequate. Very few participants were seriously dissatisfied with the quality of instruction.

In looking at the participant responses from individual training centers, it becomes clear that the quality of instruction was perceived more favorably at some centers than at others. Some centers' faculty were rated as quite satisfactory whereas others were more frequently rated as adequate. Again, there were few participants who expressed total dissatisfaction.

TABLE 4
Assessment of Workshop Faculty

How well informed about topics?	
Quite	63%
Adequately	34
Not particularly	3
How effective in responding to questions?	
Quite	51%
Adequately	43
Not particularly	5
How skillful in presenting topics?	
Quite	44%
Adequately	50
Not particularly	5
To what extent available for discussion/ consultation?	
Readily	49%
Adequately	40
Not particularly	10

Instructional Techniques

The instructional techniques that were used at training workshops and which participants viewed most favorably were demonstrations and visual aids, lectures with opportunity for questions and answers, and small group discussions. The technique perceived least favorably was a lecture with no opportunity for a question and answer period. There was no consensus of opinion as to the effectiveness of large group discussions: some participants like that approach and others did not. Thirty-three percent of the respondents wished that role-playing and individual or group projects had been used. Twenty-two percent of the respondents wanted more opportunity for individual consultation with workshop faculty. This latter finding reaffirms the strong desire of most participants to use training programs to meet with their colleagues in cooperative education.

It is important to note that the techniques which participants wished had been used (i.e., role-playing, projects) are instructional approaches that are most conducive to developing skills rather than obtaining information. These findings confirm the notion presented earlier that co-op training has tended to emphasize the conveying of information rather than the acquisition of specific skills.

Subgroups

Participants reported they were sometimes divided into subgroups based upon similarity of interests and/or instructional needs. The most frequently established subgroups were:

- junior and senior college personnel (38%)
- college and employer representatives (28%)
- personnel from liberal arts and professional curricula (20%)

Of those who attended workshops in which such subgroups were used, almost two-thirds felt it was an effective instructional approach. Employers, in particular, were found to prefer separate subgroups in training programs they attended.

Participants were also asked if they would like to attend training programs which had been designed specifically for others with similar interests and needs. The responses were consistent with those just reported: 55 percent of the respondents reported that there should be separate training for two-year personnel; 40 percent of the respondents believed that liberal arts programs should have separate training; 36 percent felt that employer representatives should have specialized training programs.

Content of Workshop

Participants were asked to respond to a series of items about the content of the workshop they attended. The first item asked whether the workshop was responsive to their needs. At the extremes, 14 percent of the respondents assessed the workshop as only slightly responsive or not at all responsive to their needs and only 39 percent reported the workshop to be very responsive. Consistent with this finding, eleven percent of the participants reported that the information presented at the workshop was not particularly useful or not useful at all. On the other hand, 97 percent of the respondents thought workshops provided sound information about co-op and thought the ideas presented were at least reasonably clear. Hence, criticisms of workshop content pertain to the usefulness and responsiveness of the material presented rather that to its accuracy or clarity. Generally, participants felt that the content of the workshops related to the stated training objectives at least moderately well.

Outcomes of Training

The Research Center sought to determine the significant outcomes of training as well as those outcomes which participants wished they had obtained. Exactly one-third of the respondents stated that the most significant outcome they achieved was learning about the concept of cooperative education in general. Other topics which were viewed as significant outcomes were:

- the role of the co-op coordinator (28%)
- the benefits of cooperative education for employers (25%)
- contact with people in co-op (24%)
- the relationship of co-op to career education (24%)

Outcomes people did not achieve but wished they had were as follows:

- the educational rationale for degree credit (16%)
- procedures and instruments to evaluate student learning (16%)
- the cost of a co-op program (15%)
- selling co-op to faculty (15%)
- role of cooperative education in the liberal arts (14%)
- public relations techniques (14%)

It is interesting to note that the outcomes most frequently cited were contact with people in co-op and general information topics related to cooperative education. The outcomes most wished for were the more specific, practical skills such as selling co-op to the faculty and evaluating student learning. Finally, it was noted that 35 percent of the respondents did not respond to the question asking which outcomes were not achieved. One can infer that this group of people achieved everything they hoped to. On the other hand, the remaining two-thirds of the attendees desired information or skills which were not obtained through their co-op training program.

Assessment of Training Workshops

When asked for a generalized assessment of the value of the workshop, 43 percent of the respondents stated that the workshop had considerable value and 37 percent stated that it had moderate value. Of concern, however, is the fact that 15 percent stated the workshop had only modest value and six percent said it had little or no value at all.

In order to better understand participant ratings, cross-tabulations were performed, using the generalized workshop assessment as one variable and various characteristics of the workshop as the other variable.[6] These cross-tabulations provided a number of interesting insights. Those persons who rated the workshop as having considerable value, also tended to rate the faculty and the overall learning environment quite highly. This suggests that if the faculty and learning environment are viewed favorably, it is likely that the workshop will also be assessed favorably. There is also a significant relationship between workshop assessment and the types of instructional approaches used. Those participants who were the most dissatisfied wished that a number of instructional approaches not used, such as role-playing, projects, and individual consultation had been used.

A greater proportion of the participants who rated the workshop as being of minimal value thought that the workshop group should have been divided into smaller instructional units. They particularly favored specialized instruction for subgroups of two year and four year representatives and for college and employer participants.

The cross-tabulations revealed an extremely high statistical association between those who rated the workshop poorly and those who felt that the workshop was not responsive to their needs. This relationship was strongly affirmed by unusually high chi-square and lambda statistics. (see Table 5) These findings suggest that continued needs assessment of potential workshop participants is vital if co-op training is to adapt to changing needs.

---

[6] For statistical reasons, the responses of those participants who said the workshop had modest, little, and no value at all were combined into one category.

TABLE 5
Relationship Between Workshop Assessment
and Responsiveness to Needs

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little, No Value at All
Very responsive	74%	20%	2%
Moderately responsive	25	74	42
Slightly responsive	1	6	47
Not at all responsive	--	--	9
	$X^2 = 1067.33$	$\lambda = .452$	$p < .001$

It was somewhat surprising to discover that there was no statistical relationship between the number of years that a person had spent in co-op and their overall assessment of the value of the workshop. The implication is that co-op training is valuable to the experienced practitioner as well as those new to cooperative education, assuming the topics address desired learning objectives.

To summarize, each component of a workshop--faculty, content learning environment, instructional approach--has a strong relationship to the participants' perception of the value of the workshop. However, the single most important factor in a person's judging the value of a workshop is whether that workshop was responsive to his or her specific needs. This finding confirms the value of conducting a needs analysis prior to developing a training program.

Direct Impacts of Training

In an effort to document the impacts of training, respondents were asked to report which impacts, from a list of possible impacts, they viewed as directly traceable to the workshop. The impact cited most frequently (38 percent of the respondents) was that they recruited more co-op students. The next most common impact was that after participating in a workshop, attendees received more support from either their faculty or administrators. Table 6 provides a full list of those outcomes people achieved.

TABLE 6
Directly Traceable Impacts

Recruited more co-op students	38%
Received more support from faculty	37
Received more support from administration	36
Expanded co-op to new curriculum areas	33
Obtained more co-op jobs	32
Conducted a program evaluation	32
Printed new brochures	28
Began a public relations campaign	27
Obtained better co-op jobs	27
Developed new procedures to evaluate students	25
Referred more high school seniors to co-op	19
Received federal grant	17
Developed workable co-op calendar	17
Implemented "learning contract" system	16
Began co-op program	15

Further analysis of the responses to this question revealed that 15 percdnt of the participants reported no directly traceable impacts of their co-op training. This group included a greater proportion of employers, teaching faculty, administrators, and other individuals who did not work directly in the field of cooperative education than did the group of respondents as a whole. These same participants were also generally less satisfied with their co-op training. They wished subgroups had been used and they had more specific and single-minded reasons for attending a training workshop than other participants. The implications of these findings for co-op trainers are clear. If training is to adequately serve those not directly involved in the operation of a co-op program, then trainers must first determine and then meet the particular needs of these special interest groups.

Learning Environment

Overall, the learning environment was viewed favorably by participants. The training staff were perceived as being friendly, helpful and usually available for informal discussion. The facilities were appropriate: food was generally good and living accommodations were suitable. Classrooms, however, could have been better. Seventeen percent of the participants reported inadequate writing surfaces, 13 percent found poor seating arrangements, and eleven percent thought classrooms were not comfortable.

Another aspect of the learning atmosphere that was less than satisfactory was the workshop schedule. Twenty percent of the respondents felt they did not have enough time to accomplish their goals. Part of the reason for these feelings may have been that the time spent at the workshop was not used efficiently, a complaint made by eleven percent of the participants. Some participants (15%) thought there were insufficient opportunities for after-session activities. Opportunities for informal interaction with colleagues are an important aspect of co-op workshops and should not be neglected.

Comparison of Junior and Senior College Participants

Many trainers and participants believe that separate training programs are desirable for two and four year college personnel. In fact, 86 percent of the two year respondents indicated they preferred separate training for two-year personnel. A comparison of the training needs of two and four year representatives showed a number of differences. A significantly greater proportion of two-year personnel wished to learn about:

- the relationship of co-op to career education
  (two-year personnel - 82%; four-year personnel - 73%)
- running an efficient co-op office
  (two-year personnel - 65%; four-year personnel - 58%)
- techniques of student recruitment
  (two-year personnel - 73%; four-year personnel - 64%)
- student counseling
  (two-year personnel - 74%; four-year personnel - 62%)
- techniques to evaluate student learning
  (two-year personnel - 74%; four-year personnel - 65%)
- co-op program evaluation
  (two-year personnel - 82%; four-year personnel - 75%)

On the other hand, a reliably higher proportion of four-year personnel (66%) than two-year personnel (54%) expressed a desire to learn about the role of co-op in the liberal arts. Hence, it seems the desire for specialized training is based on a realistic assessment of the different training needs of these two groups.

Training Needs of Experienced Co-op Personnel

It is reasonable to suspect that people who had worked in cooperative education for three or more years would have had less reason to attend training programs, considering the topics which were being offered by training centers. Comparing the responses of people new to co-op with those who had been in co-op for a number of years, the experienced co-op educator did show less interest in many topics. There were, however, a number of topics that were of interest to participants no matter how long they had been involved in cooperative education:

- costs of co-op
- selling co-op to administrators and faculty
- public relations techniques
- program evaluation
- job development
- grant proposal writing

In addition, experienced co-op practitioners particularly valued the opportunity co-op workshops provided to meet with their colleagues

Non-Participant Results

In order to better understand why people chose not to attend co-op training sessions, an attempt was made to find a sample of co-op personnel who had never attended a co-op training workshop. The sampling methodology and the data collection results were described in detail in Chapter Two. Responses were received from 42 CEA members who never attended a co-op workshop. These 42 constituted an eleven percent sample of the questionnaires mailed to potential non-participants and a 37 percent sample of those that were returned. (The other 63 percent which were returned were not useable because the respondent had participated in a training program.) The analyses and discussion that follow are based on this rather small sample of 42 persons.

The non-participant group included a smaller proportion of high school and other non-co-op personnel and a greater percentage of employers than did the sample of participants, as Table 7 clearly shows. Fifty-seven percent of the non-participants reported they had been in co-op for three years or more. This is in contrast to the participant group where only 17 percent had been in co-op for more than three years. Since people, such as high school counselors, who are not directly involved in co-op and people who are new to the field are unlikely to be members of the co-op professional society, it is not surprising that CEA membership directory would yield a somewhat biased sample.

TABLE 7
Job Titles of Participants and Non-Participants

	Participants	Non-Participants
Co-op director	15%	21%
Co-op coordinator/counselor	15	10
College administrator	16	19
Co-op employer	8	26
Teaching faculty	11	5
High school counselor	7	--
Alumni/Senior placement officer	3	5
Others	25	14

Non-participants were asked to indicate their reasons for not attending a co-op training program. Sixty-two percent of the 42 non-participants reported that they had received on-the-job training and, therefore, felt no need for a formal training program. Other reasons given by at least one-third of the respondents were: the available training programs were not relevant to their needs; the cost of attending workshops was too high; and various individual reasons.

Non-participants were asked how they obtained some of the knowledge and skill outcomes which participants hoped to attain at training programs. Most frequently, non-participants obtained information on their own. This was particularly true with regard to the following topics: relationship of co-op to career education; student recruitment and counseling techniques; selling co-op to administrators; and professional co-op societies and organizations. Fewer than 20 percent of the respondents said they gained the skills and knowledge through their co-workers or their supervisors. Other ways that non-participants learned about co-op were through use of consultants, attendance at national and regional conferences, and through reading the co-op literature.

There were a number of training topics that some non-participants said they never had learned:

- to write an acceptable grant proposal (36%)
- to develop a learning contract (33%)
- the role of co-op in the liberal arts (30%)
- to sell co-op to the faculty (24%)

These topics may well reflect unmet needs for training centers to address.

Faculty Questionnaire Results

Workshop faculty are those individuals who taught training sessions or appeared in panels. The term "faculty" does not include members of the training center staff, who were usually responsible for organizing the workshop, even though the staff members may have led some of the workshop sessions. Using this definition, there were 200 useable responses to the faculty questionnaire.

Workshop faculty were either co-op directors or coordinators (37%), co-op employers (24%), or college administrators (14%). Fifty-one percent had been working in cooperative education for more than five years and only four percent had been involved for less than one year.

Pre-Workshop Arrangements

Thirty-five percent of the faculty were given more than eight weeks notice to prepare for their workshop presentation. However, as many as 15 percent were given three weeks or less to prepare. A cross-tabulation analysis showed that the amount of lead time given to faculty was closely related to how clearly faculty understood their teaching assignment. A significantly greater proportion of those who had more than eight weeks to prepare for their workshop session(s) or panel(s) understood very clearly what they were to teach whereas those who had less time were more likely to report an adequate or inadequate understanding.

Faculty were asked whether they received particular types of information prior to the workshop. Most faculty knew the number of sessions they were to teach, the topics they were to cover, the type of audience they were to address, the length of the session to be taught and the workshop objectives. Sixty-nine percent recalled being told the size of the workshop or the specific description of the content to be taught. Fewer than half remembered receiving information about the financial matters of honoraria, consulting fees, and per diem expenses.

Almost two-thirds of the respondents reported they understood their teaching assignment very clearly prior to the workshop and almost all of the remaining third said they had an adequate understanding. Further analysis revealed that those who understood their assignment most clearly were more likely to rate the workshop in which they taught as being "excellent" or "very good", whereas those who said they only adequately understood their teaching assignment were more likely to rate the workshop as "good." Data also indicate that the more information that was received prior to the workshop, the more clearly the faculty understood their role.

Instructional Approaches

As previously observed, participants reported the instructional approach used most frequently was the lecture with an opportunity for questions and answers. Demonstration and visual aids, small group discussion, and individual consultation were the other approaches used with some frequency. Faculty responses confirm the finding that a limited number of instructional approaches were used at co-op workshops.

Workshop leaders sometimes divided participants into subgroups based upon similarity of interests and or instructional needs. The principal subgroups utilized by the faculty in our sample were two and four year college personnel (33%) and college and employer representatives (30%). As reported earlier, workshop participants would like these subgroupings to be used even more frequently.

Training Objectives

Faculty were asked what teaching objectives they had for the sessions they taught. The most frequently stated objectives, which are included in Table 8, were to teach general informational topics, such as, the benefits of co-op for employers, the concept of cooperative education, and the roles of co-op coordinators, directors and employers. Some of the least frequently mentioned teaching objectives were those that were of great concern to participants, such as, selling co-op to top administrators, co-op program costs, and issues related to academic credit.

TABLE 8
Faculty Teaching Objectives

Benefits of co-op for employers	76%
Concept of cooperative education	75
Relationship of co-op to career education	70
Role of co-op employer	69
Role of co-op coordinator, counselor, director	65
Requirements for developing viable program	57
Student counseling	49
Plans and goals of new co-op program	47
Issues related to implementation	44
Techniques of student recruitment	42
Co-op program evaluation	40
Merits of co-op for minority students	39
Selling co-op to faculty	38
Job development, sales techniques	38
Role of co-op in liberal arts	36
History of cooperative education	35
Selling co-op to top administrators	34
Educational rationale for awarding credit	29
Procedures/instruments to evaluate student learning	28
Cost of a co-op program	27
Public relations techniques	23
Running an efficient co-op office	23
Development of learning contracts	21
Professional co-op societies	21
Writing a grant proposal	7

Assessment of Training

Most faculty (97%) felt that their sessions were generally relevant to and effective in meeting the needs of participants. Nevertheless, only 44 percent felt that training programs in general are very responsive to participant needs whereas 54 percent believed training to be moderately responsive. Participants rated the responsiveness to their needs even lower: 39 percent thought training to be very responsive; 47 percent stated it was moderately responsive; and 14 percent reported it only slightly or not at all responsive.

The majority (51%) of workshop faculty thought the overall quality of the workshop in which they participated was very good. Some thought the workshop they participated in was excellent (22%) whereas others thought it was fair to good (28%). The learning environment was viewed favorably in most instances. There were two concerns raised with respect to the workshop schedule:

- 14 percent of the faculty did not have sufficient time to accomplish their goals.
- 22 percent of the faculty did not have enough time for individual consultation.

Based upon their experience and knowledge of cooperative education, faculty members were asked to what extent they belive there exists a continuing need for co-op training programs. Sixty-two percent said there is a great need, 26 percent a moderate need, and 12 percent said there is a modest need or no need at all for continued training. Although this is a generally favorable proportion, it is not a particularly enthusiastic endorsement of cooperative education training. Faculty ratings of other aspects of training programs are similarly positive but restrained. (See Table 9)

TABLE 9
Overall Assessment of Co-op Training

Training provides sound information about co-op	
Very sound	48%
Reasonably sound	49
Not particularly sound	3
Ideas and information are clear	
Very clear	37%
Reasonably clear	60
Not particularly clear	3
Information presented is practical	
Very practical	47%
Reasonably practical	49
Not particularly practical	4
Information presented is immediately useful	
Very useful	36%
Reasonably useful	58
Not particularly useful	6

In order to compare faculty assessments of individual workshops with their assessments of co-op training in general, a cross-tabulation was computed. In all instances, faculty's assessment of the workshop they participated in was closely related to their assessment of training in general.

Employer Results

Employer data were obtained in two ways. First, a questionnaire was mailed to employers who were members of either the Cooperative Education Association or the Cooperative Education Division of the American Society for Engineering Education in 1977. This questionnaire, which was described in detail earlier, asked employers to assess the importance of various workshop topics in strengthening employer/co-op program staff relationships. It was returned by 155 employers, a 60 percent response rate. A second source of data was the responses of those employers who were participants in workshops and filled out a participant questionnaire. These data reflect employers' views of the co-op training workshops they attended between 1975 and 1977. The findings of both of these analyses are consistent and are described below.

Employer Questionnaire

The data show that employers were most interested in training related to the student-employer relationship. Eighty-one percent of the employers indicated that training related to the "role of co-op students' immediate supervisor" was very important to them. Those employers who belong to the CED were particularly interested (92%) in this training topic. Other aspects of the student/employer relationship were also viewed as being very important training topics:

- assuring a balance between student learning and productivity on the job (65%)
- role of employer in student evaluation (58%)
- student selection procedures (56%)
- student's commitment and responsibility to employer (58%)

A difference between CEA and CED employers was that the CED members placed a greater emphasis on the need for training sessions on student selection procedures (69%) than did CEA members (51%).

Three other training topics were chosen as being very important:

- the concept of cooperative education in general (74%)
- the use of co-op as a device to recruit full-time employees (70%)
- selling co-op to top company management (82% - CEA, 64% - CED)

Since CED employers were more likely to have been involved in cooperative education for a longer period of time than CEA members, it was not surprising to discover that CED members were not quite as concerned with selling co-op within their company.

A number of topics relating to costs and benefits of co-op for employers were viewed as being somewhat important to employers. These included:

- relation of co-op program to company Affirmative Action Programs (38%)
- costs of co-op program for employers (38%)
- salary levels for co-op students (22%)
- company benefits for co-op students (22%)

The two subjects of least importance to employers were legal aspects of cooperative education and labor union relationship to co-op programs. Forty-five percent of the respondents rated sessions on the relation of the co-op program to labor unions as not important at all. Legal aspects were found to be somewhat more important but quite low on the list of priorities of co-op training for employers.

Fewer than half of the total group of employers had attended co-op training workshops. Of those who had attended, more had gone as workshop participants than as faculty leaders. Over half of the respondents reported knowing of colleagues, either employers or co-op coordinators/directors, who had attended a co-op training program. Only 38 percent of the employers indicated they had not attended training workshops and did not know of others who had.

Based on the responses of the 62 percent who reported having some knowledge, firsthand or otherwise, of co-op training programs, 26 percent said training needs of co-op personnel were being met very adequately. CED members expressed greater dissatisfaction than CEA members, however. Twenty percent of CED members felt needs were not being adequately met at all; only eight percent of CEA members shared that opinion.

Employer Responses to Participant Questionnaire

The other basis for judging employers' perceptions of co-op training were the responses of employers to the participant questionnaire. Sixty-five percent of this group were active employers of co-op students. The remaining 35 percent included persons who were thinking about starting a co-op program or were working in a federal agency concerned with some type of internship program. The following discussion is based on the responses of 99 employers who were workshop participants and completed the participant questionnaire.

For most participants, the workshop topic was the deciding factor in choosing a specific workshop. Among employer participants, a convenient workshop location was the top priority and relevant topics, although important, a second consideration. Virtually all employers heard about co-op workshops through the sponsoring center's direct mail announcement.

In most cases, the employer participants rated the workshop instructors as highly as the rest of the participants did. The only exception was that only 36 percent of the employers reported that faculty were quite available for individual consultation as compared to 49 percent of the participant group as a whole. This finding is consitent with a number of others which reveal that co-op training has not been responsive to special needs of employers:

- 24 percent of the employers felt the co-op workshop they attended was only slightly or not at all responsive to their needs
- 21 percent thought the information they received was not particularly useful
- 36 percent felt the workshop had but modest value for them

Employers reported fewer direct outcomes of their training experience than did the participants as a whole. Those outcomes reported with moderate frequency were: numbers of co-op students were increased; administrative support was increased; program evaluation was conducted; and procedures to evaluate student learning were implemented.

Interviews with Training Directors

Telephone interviews were conducted with 15 training center directors. Their specific responses are included in Appendix I.

All of the programs studied were federally funded. Each director stated that their training efforts would be dramatically reduced or would cease if federal funding were terminated. Two of the persons interviewed were directors of training programs whose federal funding had not been renewed and training activities did indeed stop.

The interviews were conducted under the assumption that federal money to support co-op training programs would continue to be available. Given this presupposition, directors gave their views on current practices and future directions of co-op training.

Directors were asked how workshop participants' training needs were determined. Three approaches were used:

- evaluations of and suggestions from past workshops were studied
- advice was sought from other experienced co-op educators, especially from co-sponsors of workshops
- trainers used their own expertise to assess training needs

Workshop content was then selected on the basis of participant needs as identified above. It is interesting to note that only two directors reported they determined needs or modified planned workshop content by seeking comments from prospective participants.

The instructional approaches used at most workshops were largely based on the notion that the purpose of training is to impart information. The techniques which directors mentioned most often were lecture, panel presentations, and small group discussions. Audio-visual aids and hand-out materials were used to supplement these types of presentation. Techniques considered useful in developing and refining skills, such as simulations and role-playing, were not mentioned.

Trainers usually selected workshop faculty on the basis of their reputation in the field of cooperative education, that is, their known competencies and recommendations from others. Generally, the same faculty were not used each time a workshop was conducted. Some training directors varied the faculty simply to make their offerings more diverse. Others used different faculty in different regions of the country in the interests of cost effectiveness. A few training directors had some instructors who were so expert in a subject area that they taught the subject each time it was presented.

It was interesting to observe that being a training director has typically not been a full-time responsibility. Although there were three full-time directors, the other twelve spent part of their time on training and the rest directing other aspects of cooperative education. Most training staffs have a full-time secretary and some have Assistant Directors on either a full or part-time basis.

There were a number of approaches used to identify and attract potential workshop participants. The most frequently used approach was to mail training schedules or workshop announcements to members of the Cooperative Education Association. Training directors also sent mailings to members of other professional societies and organizations, such as the Cooperative Education Division of the American Society of Engineering Education, the American Placement Council, and regional placement associations. For those cases where the training center hoped to attract individuals from one particular geographic area, announcements were sent to staff of area colleges. Mailing lists frequently included names of persons who had inquired about future workshop activities as well as those who had participated in previous workshop. Two directors used the annual list of federally funded co-op programs to supplement the names on their mailing list.

Training directors were asked to report the criteria they used to evaluate the success of their workshops. All obtained a written evaluation completed by participants at the end of each workshop. The usual questionnaire format included a scale, e.g., from "poor" to "excellent", for rating faculty, topics and facilities, and open-ended questions on strengths, weaknesses and suggestions for improvement. Using this approach, the main criteria for a successful workshop were instructional effectiveness, relevant content and appropriate training site. Conspicuously absent were measures of what was learned and how that knowledge or skill will be applied.

Some directors also held a verbal evaluation session with participants at the end of the workshop. One center conducted a follow-up survey at the end of the grant period in order to assess the entire training program. Another center hired a consultant to evaluate the success of the total training program. These other evaluation efforts were described in terms of the approach that was used rather than the criteria used to evaluate "success."

Most of the training centers did not routinely conduct post-workshop follow-ups. Follow-ups that were conducted were informal and sporadic and included answering telephone inquiries from workshop attendees, sending letters to participants, and noting the number of people who asked to be added to their mailing list. One center that specialized in workshops for high school personnel kept a record of how applicants to his co-op program learned about cooperative education. Three centers, whose training approach was to work with a few colleges in-depth and over time, visited the campuses of participating colleges as a follow-up to their workshop training activities.

Training directors felt that their most effective workshop were those which were highly specialized or those that were for people new to the field of cooperative education. The least effective workshops were those given for experienced coordinators or directors and those of such a general descriptive nature that they attracted a varied audience.

Since the federal government plays such a vital role in supporting co-op training, the Research Center sought to learn more about the training directors' views of the U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Education Branch. Training directors were thus asked whether the process of proposal writing and grant application was adequate. Responses to this question were mixed. About half of the directors thought the procedures were not adequate and particularly that: the proposal review process was not objective; criteria were too vague; readers needed more training; and training grants should be funded for a three year period to introduce stability in the staffing. On the other hand, a number of directors thought the process was quite adequate and found no problems working with the system.

Directors were asked if they felt that the federal government has set the direction of co-op training in recent years. Generally, the directors believed the Office of Education had influenced training by (1) being supportive and (2) by indirection, that is, by suggestions and individual comments in response to trainer-initiated ideas rather than by formally announcing program policies. Some of the training directors felt a direction had been set by a couple of the larger and established co-op training centers rather than by the Office of Education.

Trainers were asked to indicate how training needs have changed over the past three or four years and what direction they anticipate training will take in the next five years. There were two principal changes perceived by training directors: (1) co-op people have become more sophisticated and hence require new types of training, and (2) training needs to be more specific, to deal with problems and issues in more depth. In particular, directors felt that training needs to address:

- the problems of individual institutions
- issues relevant to certain regions
- training needs of experienced co-op personnel

As a result of these changes in needs of workshop attendees, training directors expected workshops to become more specialized in coming years. Fewer general or comprehensive programs will be offered. There will be more emphasis on program assessment, selling co-op to the high school student, and mobile training.

Directors were asked whether they believed centers should recruit and train participants who are from the geographic region in which the center is located. Twelve of the directors said "yes", there should be geographic specilization so as to avoid duplication of effort and to provide training in the most cost-effective manner possible. In addition, geographic training could focus on the specific needs of people in a particular region. Those directors who did not support geographic specialization per se said that training could be specialized but should not be limited to people from particular geographic areas. As might be expected, these comments came from directors of large training centers which have traditionally attracted people from all over the country.

Most of the directors agreed that centers should not specialize according to workshop topics. This type of specialization would lead to one center teaching, for example, "program evaluation" and another teaching "co-op in the liberal arts" and would defeat the cost-benefits of geographic specialization. Similarly, directors felt specialization according to audience would be inadvisable. Instead, each center should be able to teach workshops for employers, for co-op educators, and whatever groups they felt needed training. The thrust of the directors' comments on specialization was that: (1) specialization is desirable when it results in more cost effective training and in training that best meets participant needs; (2) the decision to specialize should be left to the individual centers.

Cost Data

Each of the training centers was asked to provide cost data for every workshop they sponsored. It was discovered that each center kept its cost information in a different manner from the others. For example, one center listed one combined figure for the travel and per diem expenses per workshop whereas another center reported these two figures separately. Cost data on mailing and telephoning were recorded either together, separately, or not at all. As a result of these wide discrepancies in record-keeping, it was not possible to compare costs either on a per center or per participant basis. Consequently, only a few general notions about training costs could be determined.

The most expensive items in most training budgets were the salaries of the training center staff and the money spent to bring faculty to the training site: honoraria; travel; and per diem. The next most expensive item in a budget was often printing costs for brochures and announcements publicizing workshops as well as literature and hand-out materials for the workshop participants. Other costs incurred by training centers were office supplies, mailing, telephone and sometimes space. For three centers, meeting space was available either at no or minimal cost to the center.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the introductory chapter of this report, five major research questions were posed. The body of this report has presented and analyzed data that were collected in order to answer these questions. The intent of this section is to summarize the findings as they relate to those initial research questions.

Are the Right Things Being Taught?

Essentially, co-op trainers are teaching appropriate topics. However, in designing programs, trainers have focused on what will occur during the training program rather than hoped-for participant outcomes. There has not been a careful formulation of learning objectives, i.e., what knowledge, skills or attitudes participants are to gain. For example, a trainer may state the goal of his workshop is "to describe the process of evaluating a co-op program." This explains what the workshop intends to do but it does not focus on the desired learning outcomes. Consider instead the following statement: "the workshop participant will be able to evaluate a co-op program with regard to cost effectiveness, recruitment techniques, faculty relations, etc." In this instance, there is a clearly defined workshop objective which emphasizes the knowledge and skill to be achieved by the participants.

Once the basic workshop goals have been clearly defined, a series of more specific learning objectives can be delineated. For example, in the workshop on evaluation described above, the following objectives may be appropriate. Participants will be able to:

- cite sources of evaluation data on campus
- list five criteria for a successful student recruitment program

- demonstrate their evaluative skills by conducting a simulated evaluation using the case study approach

These learning objectives lead directly to the training activities that will help participants to attain the hoped-for learning outcomes.

A concern expressed by a significant proportion of the participants was that training was not responsive to their needs. Since different constituencies within the field of cooperative education have different learning needs, the value of a needs assessment cannot be over-emphasized. Training directors were aware, for example, that experienced cooperative educators had more sophisticated training needs yet they were not sure exactly what they were. Participants who were not directly involved in co-op--faculty, administrators, and employers--expressed particular concern about the relevance of training to their needs. These findings point to the necessity of an assessment of potential workshop particpants' needs.

Workshop sessions could be improved if a more careful screening of potential workshop participants were done. For example, in some workshops persons with more than one year of co-op experience do not benefit greatly from the content and thus should probably not attend. The instructors then have a more homogeneous group to teach and the participants are more assured of relevant content that meets their needs.

There was other evidence to support this notion that an ongoing needs assessment is desirable. Trainers have determined participant training needs indirectly, through their own best judgement and from the advice of others, including experts in the field and past participants. Rarely have they approached participants directly or conducted a systematic survey of experts in the field.

The topics that have been taught with the highest frequency relate to:

- the role of the co-op coordinator/director
- benefits of co-op for employers

- the concept of cooperative education for non-co-op educators (i.e., high school counselors, college administrators)

A variety of other more specific topics have been presented as well, such as:

- issues of cooperative education in the community college
- co-op program evaluation
- cooperative education for graduate students
- cooperative education and its relationship to career education
- support personnel in cooperative education
- cooperative education for the handicapped student
- the role of the faculty in co-op

A comparison of these topics, with those participants wished to learn about, reveals a close correspondence. There is, therefore, a continuing need to teach most of these topics. However, since 21 percent of participants thought the workshop attendance had modest, little, or no value at all and 14 percent thought it to be only slightly or not at all responsive to their needs, it is apparent that these training topics must be either modified or supplemented.

There has been some specialization in curriculum taught among training centers. Some, for instance, focus on issues of concern to two-year co-op programs. Others offer a wide range of workshops but may have one or two unique workshops scheduled. Specialization according to topic occurs at the discretion of the training center.

Is the Training Being Competently Done?

With very few exceptions, participants felt training had been done in a competent manner. In those few instances where an instructor was perceived to be not satisfactory, participants expressed their dissatisfaction in the post-workshop evaluation questionnaires used by the training centers. Such faculty were rarely used in subsequent workshops.

Workshop faculty were generally co-op educators who had been in co-op for five years or college administrators. They were selected largely on the basis of their reputation in the field of cooperative education and the economic feasibility of bringing the instructor to the workshop. The data indicate that experts in other fields, such as training, management, or educational measurement, were rarely, if ever, used. Hence, training was based on the experiences and knowledge of those in cooperative education and was limited to that perspective.

There were three instructional techniques which were used at most workshops: demonstration and visual aid; lecture with opportunity for questions and answers; and small group discussions. There was evidence to suggest that participants would have liked a greater variety of techniques and, particularly, some role-playing, project activities and individual consultation. Since these instructional approaches provide more opportunity for applying information than the more traditional approaches commonly used, they would be highly recommended in sessions designed to develop skills.

Another effective instructional approach was the subgrouping of participants according to their particular interests and needs. For example, subgroups of two and four year people, employers and college representatives, and liberal arts and professional program personnel were found especially useful.

The instructional materials reviewed for this study were generally informational hand-outs rather than exercises, case studies, or other practice materials. Again, the emphasis has been of staff imparting information rather than participants acquiring skill or knowledge.

Given the fact that the most frequent reason for attending training workshops was to meet with others in cooperative education, the opportunities for participants to affiliate were very important. In this regard, it is vital that faculty be available throughout the workshop for formal consultations and informal conversations. Trainers should also plan time and activities to encourage interaction among participants.

Overall, the learning environment was rated highly. Training staff were competent and facilities were suitable, except for some inadequate classrooms. The workshop schedules were not viewed as positively as other aspects of the learning environment. The data indicate that more time was needed in one-fifth of the workshops. In some cases, this problem was due to the fact that time was inefficiently used.

What Are the Outcomes of Training?

Participants were asked to report the outcomes of their co-op training experience as well as the direct impact training had on their co-op program. The outcome achieved most frequently was a better knowledge and understanding of the concept of cooperative education. Other significant outcomes were:

- better understanding of the role of the co-op coordinator
- knowledge of the benefits of co-op for employers
- opportunity to meet with colleagues in co-op
- increased knowledge of the relationship of co-op to career education

The most significant outcomes were in the realm of knowledge and understanding. Practical skills, such as developing instruments to evaluate student learning or public relations techniques were reported as outcomes with notably less frequency.

The most frequent impacts for most participants were that they:

- recruited more co-op students

- received more support from faculty and administration
- expanded co-op to new curriculum areas
- obtained more jobs
- conducted a program evaluation

The data indicated, however, that those individuals who did not work directly in cooperative education were less influenced by training.

Is Training Reaching the People Who Need It?

Training programs were best publicized through announcements sent to individuals by the training centers. Some participants learned about workshops by reading the Hotline on Co-op Training which provides a useful overview of all co-op training programs to be conducted during a given year. Announcements were primarily sent to people working in cooperative education or in placement. If future co-op training programs continue to focus on the co-op educator or employer, then the present system of publicizing workshops is adequate. However, if trainers wish to reach career counselors, teaching faculty, or other persons whose professional responsibilities relate them to co-op and who might benefit from a co-op workshop, then the current mailing lists need to be expanded.

The major reason some people did not attend training programs is, quite simply, that the programs did not meet their needs. Those who have been involved in cooperative education for three years or more do not need the "basics" in co-op which frequently make up many workshop agendas. Some topics that would be of most interest to an experienced co-op educators, such as program costs and selling co-op to faculty/administrators, are rarely offered as workshop topics, though these may be included as one session within a workshop. Some employers who felt that training was not meeting their needs would encourage specific examination of the student-employer relationship.

What Does Training Cost?

There were no data available to estimate the costs of training since each training center kept its cost records in a unique manner. Some recorded costs per workshops; others, per participant. Still others had one figure for the training year. While some centers had one figure for printing, others reported separate figures for printing announcements and printing hand-out materials. In addition, three centers did not provide any cost information at all.

Two broad generalizations could be deduced. The greatest expenses in training were the salaries and travel expenses of the training staff and workshop instructors. Printing costs, for both public relations and instructional materials, were a significant expense as well.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of the national assessment of co-op training as well as an examination of the literature on training in the fields of business and education, the following recommendations are made:

Pre-Arrival Matters

1. A needs assessment should be conducted prior to the planning of any training program and training centers providing multiple workshops during the course of a year should have documentation that their proposed plans are responsive to explicit needs. A needs assessment can reveal the following important information.

   - which groups need and/or desire training
   - what topics are of importance to each group
   - what are the most desired outcomes and impacts of training

In addition to surveying potential participants, trainers may also wish to interview or send questionnaires to those persons who work with potential participants. For instance, an experienced co-op director can identify the training needs of a new coordinator better than that new coordinator can. An example of an instrument designed to address training needs follows.

SAMPLE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FORM

TRAINING NEEDS CHECKLIST

For each of the skills listed below, circle "Yes" if you believe you need training in that skill. Circle "No" if you feel no need for training in that area.

1. How to develop co-op jobs for humanities majors....... Yes No
2. How to write learning objectives for my co-op student.. Yes No
3. How to run career education seminars................. Yes No
4. How to manage my time more effectively............... Yes No
5. How to measure learning that takes place on co-op.. Yes No
6. How to manage my staff.............................. Yes No
7. How to write a grant proposal........................ Yes No
8. Other.. Yes No

2. Once a list of needs has been developed, trainers must decide whether the needs are ones that training can realistically address. Trainers must assess whether the proposed training requires changes in participant knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Although information can be acquired by participants in a three-day workshop, it is questionable whether certain types of skill development or attitudinal change can be accomplished during such a short

period. Attitudinal change, in particular, must take place over time. It is thus recommended that efforts to change attitudes, e.g., of faculty, be done by co-op educators on a particular campus who can work with their faculty over a period of time.

The following is an illustration of another problem in cooperative education that training can, at best, only partially address. Cooperative education is reaching only a small proportion of undergraduates. A workshop could be held which was devoted to "Increasing Co-op Enrollment" and focussed on topics, such as: setting up high school co-op conferences; writing and distributing public relations brochures; overcoming student concerns about cooperative education. The effectiveness of training in addressing this major need to increase co-op enrollment is seriously hampered, however, by the number of persons who may choose to attend this workshop and the fact that the influence of a short workshop is limited. If such a workshop were offered, it would have to be done with the understanding that it may help a number of colleges to partially address their own needs but it cannot address the more global concerns of cooperative educators. The point is that trainers must not only assess participant needs but must also determine whether training is an appropriate vehicle to meet those needs.

3. Once needs have been determined and training is found to be an appropriate response to the needs, a tentative curriculum and schedule must be designed. This should be done at least two months prior to the actual workshop date in order to allow:

- a minimum of six weeks advance notice to potential workshop instructors
- at least one month notice to prospective participants

4. Workshop instructors should receive the following kinds of information once they have agreed to teach a session:

- a clear picture of objectives to be attained
- schedule of workshop sessions
- probable type and size of audience
- description of facilities
- arrangements for financial reimbursement

5. Workshop announcements should include the workshop title , objectives, dates (including specific arrival and departure times), topics, names of instructional staff, registration information, costs, and travel/accommodations advice. Registration forms, which are frequently included as part of the announcement, should ask prospective participants for the following information:

- name, title, address, and phone number
- number of years experience in co-op
- a sentence or two on what workshop outcomes are sought

6. For the purpose of focusing workshop activities and discussion, trainers might wish to give participants some task to complete prior to the workshop. These tasks might be, for example, a case study, a self-study of one's own co-op program, or a plan for developing meaningful co-op assignments, and could be used during the training sessions. Trainers might also wish to send a packet of instructional materials to participants to review prior to the workshop.

7. When selecting a training site for an employer or administrator conference, trainers should recall that employers view a convenient location as their highest priority.

8. Clearly defined learning objectives are a prerequisite to curriculum development. Thus, we strongly recommend that trainers shift their orientation from imparting information to helping participants achieve learning

outcomes. Once this is accomplished, content and instructional strategies designed to achieve the learning objectives can be selected.

Training Program

1. Even though a needs assessment may not have been conducted prior to the workshop, it is still valuable and appropriate to conduct one at the beginning of the workshop. Participants, with guidance from the training staff, can spend the first hour of a workshop identifying their learning goals. This activity has the added benefit of providing an opportunity for participants to get to know each other and to establish a base for informal participant interaction. Trainers can refer to the initial goal statements throughout the workshop as topics are discussed. This serves as a unifying thread and also reminds participants that their stated needs are being addressed.

2. One of the primary reasons people attend co-op training programs is to meet with others in the field of cooperative education, particularly those with years of experience. Workshop faculty and training staff should, therefore, plan to be available to meet with participants on an individual and informal basis. Toward this end, it is recommended that all instructors remain throughout the workshop and make themselves available to participants, being present for coffee breaks, lunch, and dinners. Structured opportunities for participants to meet informally are also urged. The following activities are examples of planned opportunities for participant interaction:

- group problem-solving activity
- small group discussion of an issue in co-op
- training center sponsored social activities, e.g., social hour, tour of local area, group dinners

3. The instructional methodology used at workshops should relate directly to the learning objectives. For instances, if the objective is

to impart information, a lecture approach is appropriate. On the other hand, if the intent is to teach a skill, participants must become more actively involved in the learning process, e.g., through role-playing, simulations or problem-solving sessions.

4. A conscious effort should be made to present a flexible and balanced position toward cooperative education. Participants are generally displeased when one approach to cooperative education is promoted over others.

5. Subgrouping for instructional purposes is a valuable educational strategy. It is particularly recommended for two and four year participants, college and employer participants, and new and experienced co-op educators. By directing instruction towards specific groups, there is a greater likelihood that special needs of participants will be met.

6. At the conclusion of each training workshop, it would be useful to try to assess what has been learned. This assessment could be accomplished through a paper and pencil test or through other methods depending on the material which was to be learned. If the workshop's intent was to teach participants techniques of program evaluation, the case study method would be an appropriate way to assess whether the participant had really learned how to apply evaluation techniques. This assessment would be a valuable complement to the evaluations which have been routinely conducted and which basically measure participants reaction to the program, i.e., how well they liked it.

Post-Workshop Activities

1. It is recommended that trainers conduct a follow-up to their workshops in order to obtain a measure of the impact training has had on participant behavior or the direction of the co-op program. The following techniques are suggested:

- Between three and six months after training, send a questionnaire or conduct a structured telephone interview with a random sample of participants. Questions should focus on those changes which can be attributed to attendance at the workshop.

- Approximately six months after training send a questionnaire or conduct a structured telephone interview with the supervisor of participants to see whether changes have occurred. This activity would be of particular value if the supervisor had a "control": someone at the same level of the participant but who had not attended a training workshop.

General Recommendations

1. There is a significant body of literature in the field of training. Although most of the publications have been written for training in business, there is a great deal of information that is applicable to cooperative education training. Of particular value is the Training and Development Handbook which was sponsored by the American Society for Training and Development.[7] A list of additional resources is included as Appendix J.

2. Co-op training needs to meet the more specialized needs of the experienced co-op educators. Suggested topics include:

   - academic credit for cooperative education (role of faculty, criteria for awarding credit, evaluation techniques)
   - advanced implementation of cooperative education (elements of cost-effective co-op, working with faculty and administrators, recent developments/techniques in career counseling, program evaluation)
   - cooperative education for the adult learner
   - concepts from other disciplines and their application to co-op, e.g., management information, measurement, counseling, career education

3. The U.S. Office of Education and the co-op trainers should consider training of persons interested in but not directly involved in cooperative

---

[7] Robert L. Craig, Training and Development Handbook, A Guide to Human Resource Development, Second Edition. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976)

education. This would include potential co-op employers, high school counselors, college faculty and administrators, and college career counselors. All of these groups have the potential to support and foster the growth of cooperative education. A series of one-day workshops designed to inform these people about cooperative education as well as to improve communication between co-op educators and their colleagues could be very worthwhile.

United States, Office of Education Role

1. The criteria for an acceptable training proposal should include:
   - clearly specified learning objectives
   - content and learning activities designed to achieve the objectives
   - evidence of need for training
   - experienced staff in training and cooperative education
   - plan for assessing the effectiveness of the training program

2. Readers of training proposals should have particular competency within the field of curriculum development or training as well as knowledge of cooperative education. Readers may thus be selected from co-op educators with the appropriate qualifications and from industrial trainers who are knowledgeable about cooperative education. Orientations for readers is suggested in order to encourage consistent interpretation of proposals.

3. Although there is no reason to limit training centers to serving a particular constituency, it is reasonable for the federal government to continue to support proposals from each region of the country, assuming quality proposals have been submitted from each region. This approach encourages cost-effective training.

The U.S. Office of Education should also be alert to varieties of training purposes, even within the same region.

4. Finally, it is imperative that federal funding for cooperative education continue if training in the field of co-op is to continue and grow. Furthermore, it is recommended that the United States Office of Education consider funding for two or three year periods in order to promote a stable competent full-time professional staff. If this funding pattern were adopted, it would require careful periodic assessments of the funded training programs.

APPENDIX A

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO TRAINING DIRECTORS

NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY
360 HUNTINGTON AVENUE
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02115

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER

Dear Training Director:

This is a follow-up to my phone conversation with you regarding your participation in the national assessment of cooperative education training which is supported by a Title VIII grant. We are delighted that you will be able to participate and sincerely believe that the findings and recommendations will strengthen the training of co-op personnel.

The intent of this letter is to remind you of the purposes of the evaluation and the kinds of information we require from you to meet these purposes. The overall objective is to determine the effectiveness of the training of co-op personnel. Within this context we will seek to answer the following questions for all training programs and workshops funded during fiscal years 1975-1976 and 1976-1977:

- Are the right things being taught?
- Is the training being competently done?
- What are the outcomes of training?
- Is the training reaching people who need it?
- What does training cost?

Most of the data for this assessment will be collected from workshop participants, but in order to determine who these participants have been and to adequately assess their responses, we first need a variety of information from you. Below are summarized those data we need for each individual workshop you conducted during the past two years.

1. The announcement of each training program and workshop.

2. The audience to whom each individual workshop was addressed. (A description of the audience to whom announcements were sent, e.g., staff of two year colleges, liberal arts colleges; if available, include a copy of your mailing list.)

3. The specific objectives of each workshop. (The specific knowledge, understanding and skills participants are to take home with them.)

4. The curriculum or topics covered in each workshop. (Please include the printed agenda and any handout materials.)

5. The roster of faculty and/or workshop leaders for each workshop.

6. The roster of workshop attendees for each workshop.

Page 2

7. Summaries of participant evaluations for each workshop.
8. The direct cost of each workshop (space; faculty travel, per diem, honoraria; printing and literature acquisitions; participant stipends, etc.)

If you have any questions regarding any of these items, please call me (617) 437-3780, or Sylvia J. Brown (617) 437-3784 collect. We also want to assure you that all information which you give us will be treated with due regard for its confidentiality.

We fully appreciate that we are asking for a great deal of information and that it may entail substantial time to assemble it all. We believe, however, that this information is essential to this assessment of training and that the final results will prove of great value to the co-op community.

Sincerely,

James W. Wilson, Asa S. Knowles
Professor of Cooperative Education
and Director

JWW:mle

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Code Number

Name of Workshop

Date of Workshop

Sponsor(s)

Cooperative Education Research Center
401 Stearns Center
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

Workshop Participant Questionnaire

The questions which follow are designed to apply to all persons who have attended cooperative education training workshops. We ask you, therefore, to please complete all questions.

Section I - Pre-Arrival Matters

1. Listed below are a number of reasons which people often give for choosing to participate in a cooperative education training program. *Please circle either "Yes" or "No" next to* *each* *statement to indicate whether or not that reason applies to you.*

To gain knowledge and understanding of:	Yes	No
History of cooperative education	Y	N
Concept of cooperative education	Y	N
Professional societies and organizations in co-op.	Y	N
Relationship of co-op to career education	Y	N
Role of co-op in the liberal arts	Y	N
Benefits of co-op for employers	Y	N
Merits of co-op for minority students	Y	N
Role of the co-op coordinator, counselor, director	Y	N
Role of the co-op employer	Y	N
Plans and goals of a new co-op program	Y	N
Costs of a co-op program	Y	N
Issues related to implementation of co-op, such as calendar design, program schedule	Y	N
Requirements for developing a viable program	Y	N

	Yes	No
To obtain skills in:		
Selling co-op to top administrators	Y	N
Selling co-op to faculty	Y	N
Public relations techniques, such as brochure design, copy preparation	Y	N
Running an efficient co-op office (i.e., record-keeping procedures)	Y	N
Techniques of student recruitment	Y	N
Student counseling	Y	N
Development of procedures and instruments to evaluate student learning	Y	N
Co-op program evaluation	Y	N
Development of learning contracts	Y	N
Job development, sales techniques	Y	N
Writing a grant proposal (institutional participants only)	Y	N
Other outcomes:		
Contact with people in the field of co-op	Y	N

Other ______________________________
(Please specify)

____

2. Listed below are a number of reasons people often give for selecting a particular workshop. *Please circle either "Yes" or "No" to indicate whether each reason did or did not apply to you.*

	Yes	No
Convenient geographic location of the workshop	Y	N
Recommendation by friend, co-worker, supervisor	Y	N
Reputation of the organization(s) sponsoring workshop	Y	N
Reputation of workshop speakers	Y	N
Relevant workshop topics	Y	N

Other ______________________________
(Please specify

3. How did you hear about this particular workshop? *Please circle "Yes" or "No" next to each statement to indicate whether or not this is how you learned about the workshop.*

	Yes	No
Read about it in the HOTLINE ON CO-OP TRAINING (a joint effort of the Cooperative Education Funded Programs)	Y	N
Recommended by a colleague	Y	N
Recommended by a supervisor	Y	N
Through an announcement by workshop sponsor(s)	Y	N

Other ______________________________
(Please specify)

4. Workshop planners often send information to registered participants prior to their actual arrival. *For each type of information listed below, please indicate whether you did or did not receive it or if you cannot recall.*

	Received	Did not receive	Do not recall
Accommodations	☐	☐	☐
Cost information	☐	☐	☐
Leadership and faculty	☐	☐	☐
Proposed content of workshop	☐	☐	☐
Purpose of the workshop	☐	☐	☐
Social/recreational opportunities in area	☐	☐	☐
Travel arrangements	☐	☐	☐

Section II - Training Program

Unless the instructions indicate otherwise for the questions in this section, please place a check in the box next to the appropriate response.

5. For the most part, how well informed were the workshop instructors about their assigned topics?

Quite well-informed	☐
Adequately well-informed	☐
Not particularly well-informed	☐
Not at all well-informed	☐

6. For the most part, how effective were the workshop instructors in responding to questions raised during workshop sessions?

Quite effective	☐
Adequately effective	☐
Not particularly effective	☐
Not at all effective	☐

7. For the most part, in terms of clarity of presentation, how skillful were the workshop instructors in presenting their topics?

Quite skillful	☐
Adequately skillful	☐
Not particularly skillful	☐
Not at all skillful	☐

8. For the most part, to what extent were the workshop instructors available for informal discussion and consultation?

Readily available	☐
Adequately available	☐
Not particularly available	☐
Not available at all	☐

9. For the most part, what attitude did the workshop instructors take toward diverse approaches to cooperative education?

They demonstrated a flexible and balanced position toward differing approaches to cooperative education	☐
They demonstrated some bias toward one approach to cooperative education	☐
*They demonstrated a single-minded bias toward one approach to cooperative education	☐

*If they demonstrated a single-minded bias, what was that bias?

____

____

10. We realize that not all faculty are equally effective, that some may be particularly strong while others are less so. Since, however, it is not possible to obtain your judgment of each faculty member, we would like your generalized impression of the teaching staff and workshop leadership. *Please select the one response which best expresses your assessment.*

All or almost all were good	☐
Most were good but a few were inadequate	☐
Some were good and some were inadequate	☐
All or almost all were inadequate	☐

11. Below are listed a number of instructional techniques which may have been used in the particular workshop you attended. *In Column A, check the single technique used that you found most effective; and in Column B, check the single technique used that you found least effective. If there was a technique that was not used, but that you wish had been used at the workshop, check the appropriate box in Column C.*

Instructional Technique	Column A Single Most Effective Technique	Column B Single Least Effective Technique	Column C Technique Not Used
Demonstration and visual aid	☐	☐	☐
Group Projects	☐	☐	☐
Individual consultation	☐	☐	☐
Individual projects	☐	☐	☐
Large group discussion	☐	☐	☐
Lecture (with no opportunity for questions and answers)	☐	☐	☐
Lecture (with opportunity for questions and answers)	☐	☐	☐
Role-playing	☐	☐	☐
Small group discussion	☐	☐	☐

12. Workshop leaders often divide participants into subgroups based upon similarity of interest and/or instructional needs. For example, participants may be assigned to a subgroup based upon whether they represent a four or two year institution.

Listed below are a number of possible subgroupings which may or may not have been utilized for instructional purposes at the workshop you attended.

In Column A, place a check next to *__each__* *subgrouping utilized at your workshop.*

In Column B, for each subgrouping that was utilized (checked in Column A), place a check if you found it to be effective.

In Column C, for each subgrouping that was *__not__* *utilized (not checked in Column A) place a check if you wished it had been utilized.*

Subgroupings	Column A Subgroupings Utilized	Column B Effective Subgrouping	Column C Subgrouping Not Used
Two year and four year institutions	☐	☐	☐
Liberal arts and non-liberal arts curricula	☐	☐	☐
Large and small institutions	☐	☐	☐
Public and private institutions	☐	☐	☐
Urban and rural institutions	☐	☐	☐
College and employer representatives	☐	☐	☐

13. Some workshop participants have indicated they would like to attend training programs designed specifically for groups with similar interests and/or needs. For instance, a workshop might be held for two year college representatives only or for cooperative education employers only.

Please place a check in the box beside each possible specialized group listed below which you strongly believe should have separate and specialized training programs.

Two year colleges ☐
Four year colleges ☐
Employer representatives ☐
Large institutions ☐
Small institutions ☐
Public institutions ☐
Private institutions ☐
Urban institutions ☐
Rural institutions ☐
Liberal arts programs ☐
Non-liberal arts programs ☐

14. Each of the items in this section relate to the content of the workshop program. Naturally, it is unlikely that every segment of the workshop was equally meaningful or useful to you. But, since it is not possible to ask about each segment individually, we would like your generalized judgments about the content of the workshop.

It was responsive to my needs at the time:

Very responsive ☐
Moderately responsive ☐
Only slightly responsive ☐
Not responsive at all ☐

It provided sound information about cooperative education:

Very sound ☐
Reasonably sound ☐
Not particularly sound ☐
Not sound at all ☐

The information and ideas presented were clear:

Very clear ☐
Reasonably clear ☐
Not particularly clear ☐
Not clear at all ☐

The information presented was practical:

Very practical ☐
Reasonably practical ☐
Not particularly practical ☐
Not practical at all ☐

The information presented was useful:

Very useful ☐
Reasonably useful ☐
Not particularly useful ☐
Not useful at all ☐

The content related to the stated objectives of the workshop:

Related closely ☐
Related moderately well ☐
Did not relate particularly well ☐
Did not relate at all ☐
Did not know what objectives were ☐

15. **Below is a list of workshop outcomes which participants often feel they have achieved.**

In Column A, place a check beside each outcome you achieved or experienced.

In Column B, check the three (3) outcomes (from those checked in Column A) you believe to be the most significant outcomes for you.

In Column C, Check the three outcomes (not checked in either A or B) which you did not achieve at the workshop but wished very much that you had.

Outcomes	Column A Outcomes Achieved	Column B (3 most significant outcomes achieved)	Column C (3 outcomes did not achieve but wish you had)
ined knowledge and understanding of:			
ory of cooperative education	☐	☐	☐
ept of cooperative education	☐	☐	☐
fessional societies and organiza- s in co-op	☐	☐	☐
ationship of co-op to career ation	☐	☐	☐
of co-op in the liberal arts	☐	☐	☐
efits of co-op for employers	☐	☐	☐
lts of co-op for minority students	☐	☐	☐
of the co-op coordinator, selor, director	☐	☐	☐
of the co-op employer	☐	☐	☐
s and goals of a new co-op program	☐	☐	☐
s of a co-op program	☐	☐	☐
ational rationale for awarding ee credit	☐	☐	☐
es related to implementation of p, such as calendar design, program dule	☐	☐	☐
irements for developing a viable ram	☐	☐	☐
ined skills in:			
ing co-op to top administrators	☐	☐	☐
ing co-op to faculty	☐	☐	☐

QUESTION 15 CONTINUES ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE . . .

15. (Continued)

Outcomes	Column A Outcomes Achieved	Column B (3 most significant outcomes achieved	Column C (3 outcomes did not achieve but wish you had)
Obtained skills in:			
Public relations techniques, such as brochure design, copy preparation	☐	☐	☐
Running an efficient co-op office (i.e., record keeping procedures)	☐	☐	☐
Techniques of student recruitment	☐	☐	☐
Student counseling	☐	☐	☐
Development of procedures and instruments to evaluate student learning	☐	☐	☐
Co-op program evaluation	☐	☐	☐
Development of learning contracts	☐	☐	☐
Job development, sales techniques	☐	☐	☐
Writing a grant proposal (institutional participants only)	☐	☐	☐
Other outcomes:			
Contact with people in the field of co-op	☐	☐	☐
Other ______________________ (Please specify) ______________________	☐	☐	☐

16. What is your generalized assessment of the value this workshop had had for you?

Considerable value	☐
Moderate value	☐
Modest value	☐
Little value	☐
No value at all	☐

17. We would like to obtain information regarding the long-range impact that attending the workshop has had on you and/or your program. We would, therefore, like your candid assessment of those impacts listed below. *For each, indicate whether there is or is not an outcome* *directly traceable* *to your workshop by circling "Yes" if it is directly traceable and "No" if it is not traceable.*

	Yes	No
Received a federal grant for co-op program	Y	N
Received more support from administration	Y	N
Received more support from faculty	Y	N
Obtained more co-op jobs	Y	N
Obtained better co-op jobs	Y	N
Recruited more co-op students	Y	N
Developed useful business contracts	Y	N
Implemented "learning contract" system	Y	N
Printed new brochures	Y	N
Began a public relations campaign	Y	N
Conducted an evaluation of program	Y	N
Developed new procedures to evaluate students	Y	N
Developed a more workable co-op calendar	Y	N
Began a co-op program at my school/company	Y	N
Expanded co-op to new curriculum areas	Y	N
Referred more high school seniors to co-op institutions	Y	N

Other ______________________________________
(Please specify)

Section III - Learning Environment

18. Listed below are a series of statements about the learning environment that may have existed at the workshop you attended. *Please indicate your degree of agreement with the following statements as they relate to the workshop you attended by placing a check mark in the appropriate box on the right.*

	Yes	No	Don't Recall
Classrooms had adequate writing surfaces	☐	☐	☐
Classrooms were comfortable	☐	☐	☐
Classrooms were well-lighted	☐	☐	☐
Seating arrangements were good	☐	☐	☐

QUESTION 18 CONTINUES ON FOLLOWING PAGE . . .

18. (Continued)

	Yes	No	Don't Recall	Not Applicable
Food was generally good	☐	☐	☐	☐
Living accommodations were suitable	☐	☐	☐	☐
Training staff were helpful	☐	☐	☐	☐
Training staff were friendly	☐	☐	☐	☐
Training staff were available for discussion	☐	☐	☐	☐
Efficient use of time was made	☐	☐	☐	☐
There was enough time to accomplish goals	☐	☐	☐	☐
There sufficient opportunities for after-session activities	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section IV - Demographic Data

The following series of questions are being asked in order to determine whether training programs have differential outcomes for different groups of people.

19. *Using the list of positions below, in Column A, check your job title at the time you participated in the workshop. In Column B, place a check next to your current job title.*

	Column A Job Title at time of workshop	Column B Current Job Title
Alumni and senior placement officer	☐	☐
College administrator (such as dean, vice president	☐	☐
College president	☐	☐
Cooperative education coordinator/ counselor	☐	☐
Cooperative education director	☐	☐
Cooperative education support personnel	☐	☐
Development or grant officer	☐	☐
Employer of co-op students	☐	☐
Financial officer (such as comptroller)	☐	☐
High School counselor	☐	☐
Representatives from state and local school departments	☐	☐
Teaching faculty	☐	☐
Other ______________________ (Please specify)	☐	☐

For the following questions, please place a check in the box next to the appropriate response.

20. How long had you worked directly in the field of cooperative education prior to the workshop?

Zero to 6 months ☐
7 months to one year ☐
13 months to 3 years ☐
More than 3 years ☐
I did not/do not work in co-op ☐

21. At what type of institution did you work when you participated in the workshop?

Employer* ☐
High School* ☐
Junior or community college ☐
Senior college or university ☐
Other ______________________ ☐
(Please specify)

**IF YOU ARE AN EMPLOYER OR A HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR/TEACHER, YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.*

IF YOU ARE WORKING AT A COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY, PLEASE CONTINUE WITH THE REST OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

22. In what year was the co-op program at your institution begun?

Prior to 1970 ☐
1970 - 1971 ☐
1972 - 1973 ☐
1974 - 1975 ☐
1976 - 1977 ☐
No program, currently planning one ☐
No program, but interested in co-op ☐

23. What is the location of your college campus? (If there is more than a single branch, please refer to the branch at which you are located).

Rural or community (fewer than 10,000 people) ☐
Suburban community (between 10,000 and 100,000 people) ☐
Urban community (more than 100,000 people) ☐

24. In which of the broad curriculum areas listed below do you offer the cooperative education program?

Business ☐
Education ☐
Engineering ☐
Health related ☐
Liberal arts ☐
Occupational/vocational ☐
Other ______________________________ ☐
(Please specify)

25. Did your institution receive a United States Office of Education Title IV-D grant during the fiscal year you attended the workshop?

Yes ☐
No ☐
Do not know ☐

26. Has your institution subsequently received a United States Office of Education Title IV-D or Title VIII grant?

Yes ☐
No ☐
Do not know ☐

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY.

APPENDIX C

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

______ Code Number	______ Name of Workshop
	______ Date of Workshop
	______ Sponsor of Workshop

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION RESEARCH CENTER
401 Stearns Center
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I - Pre-Arrival Matters

1. Approximately how much lead time were you given between the time you were invited to participate in the workshop and the scheduled workshop?

   - More than eight weeks ☐
   - Six to seven weeks ☐
   - Four to five weeks ☐
   - Two to three weeks ☐
   - Fewer than two weeks ☐

2. Did you receive the following types of information prior to your workshop presentation? *(For each type of information listed below, please check "Yes" or "No" to indicate whether you did or did not receive the information).*

	Yes	No	Do Not Recall
Objectives of workshop	Y	N	DNR
Topic headings to be covered	Y	N	DNR
Specific description of content to be taught	Y	N	DNR
Kind of instructional approach to be used (i.e., lecture, group discussion)	Y	N	DNR
Number of sessions for which you would be responsible	Y	N	DNR
Length of each session you would teach	Y	N	DNR
Type of workshop audience (i.e., employers, faculty)	Y	N	DNR
Size of group attending workshop	Y	N	DNR

CONTINUE THIS QUESTION ON NEXT PAGE . . .

2. (Continued)

	Yes	No	Do Not Recall
Honoraria/consulting fees	Y	N	DNR
Per diem	Y	N	DNR
Travel arrangements	Y	N	DNR
Type of living accommodations	Y	N	DNR

3. How clearly did you understand your assignment prior to your attendance at the workshop?

Very clearly ☐
Adequately ☐
Not clearly at all ☐

Section 2 - Training Program

4. Which instructional approach(es) did you use in your presentation(s)? *(Please check "Yes" or "No" to indicate whether or not you used each approach).*

	Yes	No
Demonstration and visual aids	Y	N
Group Projects	Y	N
Individual consultation	Y	N
Individual projects	Y	N
Large group discussions	Y	N
Lecture (with no opportunity for questions and answers)	Y	N
Lecture (with opportunity for questions and answers)	Y	N
Role playing	Y	N
Small group discussion	Y	N

5. People who attend co-op training workshops may have a variety of reasons for choosing to participate in these workshops. Listed below are some frequently mentioned objectives people hope to attain by attending a co-op workshop. *Please indicate whether the objectives of the session(s) you taught correspond with any of the participant objectives by circling "Yes" if your session(s) was designed to achieve the objective and "No" if it was not designed to achieve the objective.*

	Yes	No
To enhance knowledge and understanding of:		
History of cooperative education	Y	N
Concept of cooperative education	Y	N

CONTINUE THIS QUESTION ON NEXT PAGE . . .

5. (Continued)

To enhance knowledge and understanding of:	Yes	No
Professional societies and organizations in co-op	Y	N
Relationship of co-op to career education	Y	N
Role of co-op in the liberal arts	Y	N
Benefits of co-op for employers	Y	N
Merits of co-op for minority students	Y	N
Role of the co-op coordinator, counselor, director	Y	N
Role of the co-op employer	Y	N
Plans and goals of a new co-op program	Y	N
Costs of a co-op program	Y	N
Issues related to implementation of co-op, such as calendar design, program schedule	Y	N
Requirements for developing a viable program	Y	N
Educational rationale for awarding degree credit	Y	N
To teach skills in:		
Selling co-op to top administrators	Y	N
Selling co-op to faculty	Y	N
Public relations techniques, such as brochure design, copy preparation	Y	N
Running an efficient co-op office (i.e., record-keeping procedures)	Y	N
Techniques of student recruitment	Y	N
Student counseling	Y	N
Development of procedures and instruments to evaluate student learning	Y	N
Co-op program evaluation	Y	N
Development of learning contracts	Y	N
Job development, sales techniques	Y	N
Writing a grant proposal	Y	N

6. Do you believe your session(s) were generally relevant with regard to the needs of participants?

Yes ☐
No ☐

7. Do you believe your session(s) were generally effective with regard to participant needs?

Yes ☐
No ☐

8. What was your assessment of the overall quality of the workshop you participated in?

Excellent ☐
Very good ☐
Good ☐
Fair ☐
Poor ☐

9. Workshop leaders often divide participants into subgroups based upon similarity of interest and/or instructional needs. For example, participants may be assigned to a subgroup based upon whether they represent a four or two year institution.

Listed below are a number of possible subgroupings which may or may not have been established for instructional purposes at the session(s) you taught.

Please place a check next to each subgrouping to indicate whether you did or did not utilize it in your session(s).

Subgroupings	Yes	No
Two year and four year institutions	Y	N
Liberal arts and non-liberal arts curricula	Y	N
Large and small institutions	Y	N
Public and private institutions	Y	N
Urban and rural institutions	Y	N
College and employer representatives	Y	N

10. To what extent do you feel that your qualifications and experience were relevant to the tasks and goals you were asked to accomplish at this workshop?

Very relevant ☐
Reasonably relevant ☐
Not particularly relevant ☐
Not relevant at all ☐

Section 3 - Learning Environment

11. **Listed below are a series of statements about the learning environment that may have existed at the workshop you attended.** *Please indicate whether they did or did not exist by circling the appropriate response.*

	Yes	No	Do Not Recall
Classrooms were well ventilated	Y	N	DNR
Classrooms were suited for your instructional needs (i.e., if you needed chalk and blackboards, it was made available)	Y	N	DNR
Classrooms were well lighted	Y	N	DNR
Seating arrangements were good	Y	N	DNR
Food was generally good	Y	N	DNR
Living accommodations were suitable	Y	N	DNR
Training staff were helpful	Y	N	DNR
Training staff were friendly	Y	N	DNR
There were sufficient opportunities for after session activities	Y	N	DNR
There was enough time for you to accomplish your goals	Y	N	DNR
Your time was used efficiently	Y	N	DNR
There was time for individual consultation	Y	N	DNR

Section 4 - Assessment of Training

12. *Based on your experiences as a workshop teacher, please respond to the following statements which are concerned with your assessment of current cooperative education training efforts. Place a check next to the response that best reflects your overall evaluation of co-op training programs.*

Training is responsive to the needs of workshop participants.

Very responsive ☐
Moderately responsive ☐
Only slightly responsive ☐
Not responsive at all ☐

Training programs provide sound information about cooperative education.

Very sound ☐
Reasonably sound ☐
Not particularly sound ☐
Not sound at all ☐

The ideas and information presented are clear.

Very clear ☐
Reasonably clear ☐
Not particularly clear ☐
Not clear at all ☐

The information presented is practical.

Very practical ☐
Reasonably practical ☐
Not particularly practical ☐
Not practical at all ☐

The information presented is immediately useful.

Very useful ☐
Reasonably useful ☐
Not particularly useful ☐
Not useful at all ☐

13. Based upon your experience and knowledge of cooperative education, to what extent do you believe there exists a continuing need for co-op training programs?

Great need ☐
Moderate need ☐
Modest need ☐
No need at all ☐

Section 5 - Demographic Information

The following questions are being asked in order to better understand the background of workshop faculty.

14. *Using the list of positions below, in Column A, check the term that* *__best__* *describes your job title at the time you participated in the workshop. In Column B, place a check next to the term that* *__best__* *describes your current job title.*

	Column A Job Title at Time of Workshop	Column B Current Job Title
Cooperative education coordinator/counselor	☐	☐
Cooperative education director	☐	☐
Teaching faculty	☐	☐
Cooperative education training center staff	☐	☐
Employer of co-op students	☐	☐
Office of Education staff	☐	☐
College administrator	☐	☐
College president	☐	☐

Other ______________________________

____

(Please specify)

15. How long had you worked in the field of cooperative education prior to the workshop?

More than five years ☐
13 months to five years ☐
One year to three years ☐
Less than a year ☐
I do not/did not work in co-op ☐

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY

APPENDIX D

EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

Code Number

Cooperative Education Research Center
401 Stearns Center
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

EMPLOYER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. There is a variety of information which may be taught at cooperative education training workshops. Listed below are some possible workshop topics which might aid in strengthening employer-co-op program staff relationships. *Please give us your assessment of the importance of these training topics by placing a check in the appropriate box to the right of each topic.*

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important At All
Concept of cooperative education	☐	☐	☐
Selling co-op to top company management	☐	☐	☐
Use of co-op as device to recruit full-time employees	☐	☐	☐
Assuring a balance between student learning and productivity on the job	☐	☐	☐
Legal aspects of co-op program, i.e., unemployment compensation	☐	☐	☐
Relation of co-op program to labor union(s)	☐	☐	☐
Relation of co-op program to company Affirmative Action Program	☐	☐	☐
Role of employer in student evaluation	☐	☐	☐
Role of co-op student's immediate supervisor	☐	☐	☐
Costs of co-op program for employers	☐	☐	☐
Student selection procedures	☐	☐	☐
Student's commitment and responsibility to employer	☐	☐	☐
Salary levels for co-op students	☐	☐	☐
Company benefits for co-op students	☐	☐	☐
Other ______________________ (Please specify)	☐	☐	☐

2. Have you or any of your employer colleagues ever attended a co-op training workshop?

   Yes, I have attended as a workshop leader ☐
   Yes, I have attended a as a workshop participant ☐
   Yes, an employer colleague has attended ☐
   No ☐
   I do not know of any colleagues who have attended ☐

3. Do you know of any institutional co-op coordinators/directors who have attended a co-op training program?

   Yes ☐
   No ☐
   I do not know of any who have attended ☐

IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" OR "DO NOT KNOW" TO QUESTIONS 2 AND 3, YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO EITHER QUESTION 2 OR 3, PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 4.

4. Based upon your experience with and/or knowledge of co-op training activities, do you feel training needs of co-op personnel are being adequately met?

   Very adequately ☐
   Somewhat adequately ☐
   Not adequate at all ☐
   I am not sure ☐

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX E

NON-PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Code Number

Cooperative Education Research Center
401 Stearns Center
360 Huntington Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

NON-PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please place a check next to the statement which best describes your co-op training workshop participation.

*Participated in a co-op training program during the period beginning July 1, 1975 and ending June 30, 1977. ☐

*Participated in a co-op training program before July 1, 1975 or since June 30, 1977. ☐

Have never participated in a co-op training program. ☐

*If you have checked the first and/or the second option above, there are no additional questions to which you need to respond. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your cooperation.

2. There are various reasons people have for choosing not to attend a co-op training workshop. A number of the most frequently mentioned reasons are listed below.

Please circle "yes" or "no" next to each reason listed below to indicate whether it did or did not apply to you in your decision to not participate in a co-op training program.

	Yes	No
I have been a co-op educator for many years and felt no need for formal training programs.	Y	N
I received on-the-job training and felt no need for formal training programs.	Y	N
I was unable to find a conveniently located training program.	Y	N
I was unable to find a workshop that discussed topics in which I was interested.	Y	N
The cost of attending the workshop was prohibitive.	Y	N

PLEASE CONTINUE THIS QUESTION ON THE NEXT PAGE . . .

	Yes	No
I do not feel training programs, in general, help a person to do their job any better.	Y	N
I was not aware that training for co-op personnel existed.	Y	N

Other reason(s) ____________________

____
Please specify

3. People have various reasons for choosing to attend a co-op training program. For the most part, they seek to gain specific information and to improve their skills.

Listed below are specific kinds of information and skills that participants seek. As a person who has not participated in a training workshop, please indicate, by placing a check in the appropriate box next to each statement, how you obtained this information or developed these skills. (Please check as many boxes as applicable)

Type of Information or Skill	From My Supervisor	From My Co-Workers	On My Own	Never Did	*Other
Concept of cooperative education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professional societies and organizations in co-op	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Relationship of co-op to career education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Role of co-op in the liberal arts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Benefits of co-op for employers	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Merits of co-op for minority students	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Role of the co-op coordinator, counselor, director	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Role of the co-op employer	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Plans and goals of a new co-op program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please use the space provided on the next page to explain how you obtained this information or developed this skill.

(QUESTION 3 CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

	From My Supervisor	From My Co-Workers	On My Own	Never Did	*Other
Costs of a co-op program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Issues related to implementation of co-op, such as calendar design, program schedule	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Requirements for developing a viable program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Selling co-op to top administrators	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Selling co-op to faculty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public relations techniques, such as brochure design, copy preparation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Running an efficient co-op office (i.e., recordkeeping procedures)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Techniques of student recruitment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student counseling	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Development of procedures and instruments to evaluate student learning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Co-op program evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Development of learning contracts	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Job development, sales techniques	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Writing a grant proposal (institutional participants only)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

**Please use the space provided below to explain how you obtained this information or developed this skill.*

Type of Information or Skill	How Obtained Information or Developed Skill
______________________	______________________________
______________________	______________________________
______________________	______________________________
______________________	______________________________
______________________	______________________________

4. If you were to attend a training workshop, which of the topics listed below would be of particular interest to you?

Please place a check next to the statement to indicate whether it is or is not important to you.

	Important To Me	Not Important To Me
To gain knowledge and understanding of:		
History of cooperative education	☐	☐
Concept of cooperative education	☐	☐
Professional societies and organizations in co-op	☐	☐
Relationship of co-op to career education	☐	☐
Role of co-op in liberal arts	☐	☐
Benefits of co-op for employers	☐	☐
Merits of co-op for minority students	☐	☐
Role of the co-op coordinator, counselor, director	☐	☐
Role of the co-op employer	☐	☐
Plans and goals of a new co-op program	☐	☐
Costs of a co-op program	☐	☐
Issues related to implementation of co-op, such as calendar design, program schedule	☐	☐
Requirements for developing a viable program	☐	☐
To obtain skills in:		
Selling co-op to top administrators	☐	☐
Selling co-op to faculty	☐	☐
Public relations techniques, such as brochure design, copy preparation	☐	☐
Running an efficient co-op office (i.e., recordkeeping procedures)	☐	☐
Techniques of student recruitment	☐	☐
Student counseling	☐	☐
Development of procedures and instruments to evaluate student learning	☐	☐

	Important To Me	Not Important To Me
Co-op program evaluation	☐	☐
Development of learning contracts	☐	☐
Job development, sales techniques	☐	☐
Writing a grant proposal (institutional participants only)	☐	☐

5. Using the list of positions below, please place a check next to the one which best describes your current job title.

Alumni and senior placement officer ☐

College administrator (such as dean, vice president) ☐

College president ☐

Cooperative education coordinator/counselor ☐

Cooperative education director ☐

Cooperative education support personnel ☐

Development or grant officer ☐

Employer of co-op students ☐

Financial officer (such as comptroller) ☐

High School counselor ☐

Representatives from state and local school departments ☐

Teaching faculty ☐

Other ________________________ ☐
(Please specify)

6. How long have you worked directly in the field of cooperative education?

Zero to 6 months ☐

7 months to 1 year ☐

(QUESTION 6 CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

13 months to 3 years ☐

More than 3 years ☐

I did not/do not work in co-op ☐

7. At what type of institution do you work?

Employer ☐

High School ☐

Junior or community college ☐

Senior college or university ☐

Other ____________________ ☐
(Please specify)

8. In which state is your institution located? ____________________

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY!

APPENDIX F

TRAINING DIRECTOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

Cooperative Education Research Center
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

Interview Guide - Training Center Directors

1. a. How are training needs determined?

   b. What is the process of selecting topics and methods of presentation to meet these needs?

2. a. How are workshop faculty selected?

   b. Do the same faculty teach the same topic each time a workshop is presented? If not, why is this so?

3. How many full-time and part-time staff members do you have?

4. How is the mailing list developed, i.e., who are the potential workshop participants?

5. What criteria do you use to evaluate the success of your workshops. Do you conduct any post-workshop follow-up? Do you have any other feedback mechanisms?

6. Which do you judge to be the most effective workshop(s) run by your Center? Why?

7. Which do you judge to be the least effective workshop(s)? Why?

8. Do you know if other training centers are offering the same or similar topics as you do? Do you try to avoid this? If so, why and if not, why not?

9. a. Is the present process of proposal writing and grant application adequate?

   b. Would your training efforts cease or diminish considerably if federal support was withdrawn?

10. Do you feel the federal government has set the direction of co-op training during the past few years? If so, how?

11. How have training needs changed over the past three or four years?

12. a. What direction do you expect co-op training to take in the next five years?

b. Do you feel training should be specialized according to geographic region? Topics? Type of audience?

APPENDIX G

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, COOPERATIVE EDUCATION BRANCH INTERVIEW GUIDE

Cooperative Education Research Center
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

Interview Guide - Staff of Cooperative Education Branch of United States Office of Education

1. What do you perceive to be the training needs of co-op educators, based upon your contacts with persons seeking to initiate co-op programs and on your reading of grant proposals?

2. Do you feel training programs are meeting these perceived needs? Are some meeting them more effectively than others? If so, why?

3. Do you think training needs changed over the past three or four years? Has training programs' orientation changed concomitantly?

4. What are the strong points of co-op training? What are the weak points?

5. Is the government trying to evolve a particular direction for co-op training, through the grant application process and/or through public statements, or is the government generally responding to the training ideas that are sent it? Which of these two roles is the proper role for the U.S. Office of Education staff or are both roles compatible? With respect to the former role, how is the government conveying its preferences? With respect to the latter role, what criteria are used to decide which training proposals to fund, and how are these criteria determined? Is the reader process satisfactory from your point of view?

6. Do you think training centers should specialize according to region? Topics? Type of audience?

7. What directions do you envision co-op training taking for next five years?

APPENDIX H

TABLES OF DATA FROM MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES

PARTICIPANTS

CURRENT JOB TITLES

COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR (SUCH AS DEAN, VICE PRESIDENT)	16%
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION COORDINATOR/COUNSELOR	15
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION DIRECTOR	15
TEACHING FACULTY	11
EMPLOYER OF CO-OP STUDENTS	8
HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR	7
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION SUPPORT PERSONNEL	4
ALUMNI/SENIOR PLACEMENT OFFICER	3
TEACHING FACULTY AND CO-OP COORDINATOR	3
COLLEGE COUNSELOR	3
COLLEGE PRESIDENT	2
OTHER (SUCH AS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER, STATE AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE)	12

LENGTH OF TIME IN CO-OP

ZERO TO 6 MONTHS	27%
7 MONTHS TO 1 YEAR	14
13 MONTHS TO 3 YEARS	18
MORE THAN 3 YEARS	16
I DID NOT/DO NOT WORK IN CO-OP	26

TYPE OF INSTITUTION WORK FOR

EMPLOYER	10%
HIGH SCHOOL	10
JUNIOR/COMMUNITY COLLEGE	36
SENIOR COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	41
OTHER (SUCH AS STATE OR FEDERAL AGENCY)	3

YEAR CO-OP BEGAN AT COLLEGE

PRIOR TO 1970	22%
1970-1971	9
1972-1973	18
1974-1975	24
1976-1977	18
NO PROGRAM BUT PLANNING ONE	3
NO PROGRAM BUT INTERESTED	6

LOCATION OF COLLEGE CAMPUS

RURAL	17%
SUBURBAN	43
URBAN	39

CURRICULUM AREAS OFFERING CO-OP

BUSINESS	74%
LIBERAL ARTS	53
OCCUPATIONAL/VOCATIONAL	44
ENGINEERING	39
HEALTH RELATED	34
EDUCATION	30
OTHER (I.E., AGRICULTURE)	3

REASONS FOR SELECTING PARTICULAR WORKSHOP

RELEVANT WORKSHOP TOPICS	88%
CONVENIENT LOCATION	76
REPUTATION OF ORGANIZATION	60
RECOMMENDATION	56
REPUTATION OF SPEAKERS	52

HOW PARTICIPANT HEARD ABOUT WORKSHOP

Announcement by workshop sponsor	66%
Recommended by colleague	36
Recommended by supervisor	34
Read about workshop in HOTLINE	33

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES USED--MOST EFFECTIVE

LECTURE, WITH QUESTIONS	55%
DEMONSTRATION AND VISUAL AID	32
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS	30
LARGE GROUP DISCUSSIONS	27
INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION	15
GROUP PROJECTS	13
INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS	7
ROLE-PLAYING	7
LECTURE, NO QUESTIONS	3

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES USED--LEAST EFFECTIVE

LECTURE, NO QUESTIONS	33%
LARGE GROUP DISCUSSIONS	19
ROLE-PLAYING	9
GROUP PROJECTS	8
INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS	6
DEMONSTRATION AND VISUAL AID	6
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION	6
INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION	6
LECTURE, WITH QUESTIONS	6

INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES NOT USED

ROLE-PLAYING	33%
INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS	25
GROUP PROJECTS	23
INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION	22
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION	19
LECTURE, NO QUESTIONS	19
DEMONSTRATION AND VISUAL AID	13
LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION	4
LECTURE, WITH QUESTIONS	1

SUBGROUPINGS UTILIZED AND EFFECTIVE

TWO YEAR AND FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS	38%	(64%)
LIBERAL ARTS AND NON-LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULA	20	(68)
LARGE AND SMALL INSTITUTIONS	17	(63)
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	15	(60)
URBAN AND RURAL INSTITUTIONS	9	(53)
COLLEGE AND EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVES	28	(72)

SUBGROUPINGS WISH HAD BEEN UTILIZED

TWO YEAR AND FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS	38%
LIBERAL ARTS AND NON-LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULA	44
LARGE AND SMALL INSTITUTIONS	45
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	44
URBAN AND RURAL INSTITUTIONS	48
COLLEGE AND EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVES	40

SUPPORT SEPARATE TRAINING FOR SUBGROUPS

TWO YEAR COLLEGES	55%
LIBERAL ARTS PROGRAMS	40
FOUR YEAR COLLEGES	38
EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVES	36
SMALL INSTITUTIONS	24
NON-LIBERAL ARTS PROGRAMS	22
RURAL PROGRAMS	20
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS	18
PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	16
URBAN INSTITUTIONS	16
LARGE INSTITUTIONS	13

GENERALIZED JUDGMENTS ABOUT WORKSHOP CONTENT

RESPONSIVE TO NEEDS	
VERY RESPONSIVE	39%
MODERATELY RESPONSIVE	47
ONLY SLIGHTLY RESPONSIVE	12
NOT RESPONSIVE AT ALL	2
PROVIDED SOUND INFORMATION ABOUT CO-OP	
VERY SOUND	52%
REASONABLY SOUND	45
NOT PARTICULARLY SOUND	3
NOT SOUND AT ALL	1
INFORMATION AND IDEAS PRESENTED WERE CLEAR	
VERY CLEAR	46%
REASONABLY CLEAR	51
NOT PARTICULARLY CLEAR	3
NOT CLEAR AT ALL	1
INFORMATION PRESENTED WAS PRACTICAL	
VERY PRACTICAL	37%
REASONABLY PRACTICAL	55
NOT PARTICULARLY PRACTICAL	8
NOT PRACTICAL AT ALL	1
INFORMATION PRESENTED WAS USEFUL	
VERY USEFUL	37%
REASONABLY USEFUL	52
NOT PARTICULARLY	10
NOT USEFUL AT ALL	1
CONTENT RELATED TO OBJECTIVES	
RELATED CLOSELY	53%
RELATED MODERATELY WELL	41
DID NOT RELATE PARTICULARLY WELL	5
DID NOT RELATE AT ALL	1
DID NOT KNOW	2

Relationship Between Workshop Assessment and Assessment of Faculty

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little or No Value
All or almost all faculty good	86%	63%	35%
Most good, few inadequate	14	33	42
Some good, some inadequate	—	4	19
All or almost all inadequate	—	—	4

$X^2=349.07$ $p < .001$

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT AND DESIRED INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH

	CONSIDERABLE VALUE	MODERATE VALUE	MODEST, LITTLE, OR NO VALUE
WISH GROUP PROJECTS USED	18%	26%	29%
NO COMMENT	82	74	71
$X^2 = 18.16$		$P < .01$	
WISH INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION USED	16%	25%	30%
NO COMMENT	84	75	70
$X^2 = 26.72$		$P < .001$	
WISH INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS USED	20%	29%	30%
NO COMMENT	80	71	70
$X^2 = 15.38$		$P < .01$	
WISH ROLE-PLAYING USED	28%	37%	38%
NO COMMENT	72	63	62
$X^2 = 14.83$		$P < .01$	
WISH SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION USED	13%	22%	28%
NO COMMENT	87	78	71
$X^2 = 35.55$		$P < .001$	

Relationship Between Workshop Assessment and Subgroupings Utilized

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little, or No Value at all
Two-year/four-year institutions subgroup used	43%	34%	24%
Not used/not applicable	57	66	76

$X^2 = 30.76$ $p < .001$

Relationship Between Workshop Assessment and Subgroupings Wish Had been Utilized

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little, No Value at all
Wish had used Two year/four year	34%	40%	44%
No, not applicable	66	60	56

$X^2 = 18.01$ $p < .05$

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little, No Value at all
Wish had used College/employees	36%	41%	49%
No, not applicable	64	59	51

$X^2 = 20.42$ $p < .01$

Relationship Between Workshop Assessment and Usefulness of Information Presented

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little, No Value at All
Very useful	67%	21%	4%
Moderately useful	33	75	48
Slightly useful	—	4	44
Not useful at all	—	—	4
	$X^2=900.86$	$p < .001$	

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT AND LONG-RANGE IMPACT OF TRAINING

	CONSIDERABLE VALUE	MODERATE VALUE	MODEST, LITTLE, NO VALUE AT ALL
RECEIVED GRANT	27%	13%	4%
DID NOT RECEIVE GRANT	73	87	96
$X^2=75.27$		$P < .001$	
RECEIVED MORE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	54%	30%	9%
DID NOT RECEIVE MORE SUPPORT	46	70	91
$X^2=180.88$		$P < .001$	
RECEIVED MORE FACULTY SUPPORT	56%	28%	12%
DID NOT RECEIVE MORE SUPPORT	44	72	88
$X^2=183.00$		$P < .001$	
RECRUITED MORE CO-OP STUDENTS	54%	33%	14%
DID NOT RECRUIT MORE STUDENTS	46	67	86
$X^2=133.86$		$P < .001$	

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

	CONSIDERABLE VALUE	MODERATE VALUE	MODEST, LITTLE, NO VALUE AT ALL
TRAINING STAFF AVAILABLE FOR DISCUSSION	93%	84%	67%
NOT AVAILABLE, NOT APPLICABLE, DO NOT RECALL	7	16	33
X^2=111.29		$P < .001$	
EFFICIENT USE OF TIME MADE	95%	84%	60%
NOT EFFICIENT, NOT APPLICABLE, DO NOT RECALL	5	16	40
X^2=202.00		$P < .001$	
ENOUGH TIME TO ACCOMPLISH GOALS	83%	69%	55%
NOT ENOUGH TIME, NOT APPLICABLE, DO NOT RECALL	17	31	45
X^2=98.62		$P < .001$	
OPPORTUNITIES FOR AFTER-SESSION ACTIVITIES	79%	65%	48%
NO OPPORTUNITIES, NOT APPLICABLE, DO NOT RECALL	21	35	52
X^2=101.11		$P < .001$	

Relationship Between Workshop Assessment and Length of Time in Co-op

	Considerable Value	Moderate Value	Modest, Little, No Value at All
0-6 months	30%	24%	25%
7 months - 1 YEAR	14	14	12
13 months-3 years	18	20	15
More than 3 years	17	16	17
Do not work in co-op	22	26	31

$X^2=15.08$ $p = .05$

LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

ADEQUATE WRITING SURFACES	74%
CLASSROOMS COMFORTABLE	85
CLASSROOMS WELL-LIGHTED	89
SEATING ARRANGEMENTS GOOD	83
FOOD WAS GOOD	80
LIVING ACCOMMODATIONS SUITABLE	59
TRAINING STAFF HELPFUL	91
TRAINING STAFF FRIENDLY	94
TRAINING STAFF AVAILABLE FOR DISCUSSION	85
EFFICIENT USE OF TIME	84
TIME TO ACCOMPLISH GOALS	72
SUFFICIENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR AFTER-SESSION ACTIVITIES	68

LENGTH OF TIME IN CO-OP--
JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE COMPARISON

	JUNIOR COLLEGE	SENIOR COLLEGE
0-6 MONTHS	28%	30%
7 MONTHS-1 YEAR	14	15
13 MONTHS-3 YEARS	21	21
MORE THAN 3 YEARS	18	15
DO NOT WORK IN CO-OP	19	19

$X^2=2.17$ $P > .05$

REASONS FOR ATTENDING WORKSHOPS-- JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE COMPARISON

	JUNIOR COLLEGE	SENIOR COLLEGE
RELATIONSHIP OF CO-OP TO CAREER EDUCATION	82%	73%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	18%	27
$X^2=12.14$		$P < .001$
ROLE OF CO-OP IN LIBERAL ARTS	54%	66%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	46	34
$X^2=15.18$		$P < .001$
RUNNING AN EFFICIENT CO-OP OFFICE	65%	58%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	35	42
$X^2=6.28$		$P < .05$
TECHNIQUES OF STUDENT RECRUIT MENT	73%	64%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	27	36
$X^2=9.45$		$P < .01$
STUDENT COUNSELING	74%	62%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	26	38
$X^2=18.66$		$P < .001$

REASONS FOR ATTENDING WORKSHOPS--(CONTINUED)

TECHNIQUES TO EVALUATE STUDENT LEARNING	74%	65%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	26	35
$X^2=10.57$	$P < .01$	
CO-OP PROGRAM EVALUATION	82%	75%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	18	25
$X^2=8.27$	$P < .01$	
CONTACT WITH PEOPLE IN CO-OP	85%	89%
ABOVE NOT AN INTEREST	15	11
$X^2=4.13$	$P < .05$	

RELATIONSHIP OF WORKSHOP CONTENT TO OBJECTIVES-- JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE COMPARISON

	JUNIOR COLLEGE	SENIOR COLLEGE
CLOSELY	59%	50%
MODERATELY WELL	37	41
NOT PARTICULARLY WELL	4	6
NOT RELATED AT ALL	—	1
DID NOT KNOW WHAT OBJECTIVES WERE	1	2

$X^2=17.36$ $P < .01$

PREFERENCE FOR SPECIALIZED TRAINING--JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE COMPARISON

	JUNIOR COLLEGE	SENIOR COLLEGE
PREFER SEPARATE TWO YEAR	86%	35%
NO PREFERENCE NOTED	14	65
$X^2=299.92$	$P < .001$	
PREFER SEPARATE FOUR YEAR	19%	58%
NO PREFERENCE NOTED	81	42
$X^2=168.98$	$P < .001$	
PREFER SEPARATE FOR LARGE INSTITUTIONS	8%	18%
NO PREFERENCE NOTED	92	82
$X^2=23.24$	$P < .001$	
PREFER SEPARATE PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	11%	24%
NO PREFERENCE NOTED	89	76
$X^2=28.09$	$P < .001$	
PREFER SEPARATE LIBERAL ARTS	31%	60%
NO PREFERENCE NOTED	69	40
$X^2=91.56$	$P < .001$	

LONG-RANGE IMPACTS OF TRAINING--
JUNIOR AND SENIOR COLLEGE COMPARISON

	JUNIOR COLLEGE	SENIOR COLLEGE
RECEIVED MORE ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT		
YES	45%	36%
NO	55	64
$X^2 = 7.71$	$P < .01$	
RECEIVED MORE FACULTY SUPPORT		
YES	45%	39%
NO	55	61
$X^2 = 3.30$	$P < .07$	
IMPLEMENTED "LEARNING CONTRACT"		
YES	25%	12%
NO	75	88
$X^2 = 28.20$	$P < .001$	

LONG-RANGE IMPACTS OF TRAINING--(CONTINUED)

CONDUCTED AN EVALUATION OF PROGRAM		
YES	40%	31%
NO	60	69
$X^2 = 10.17$	$P < .01$	
DEVELOPED PROCEDURES TO EVALUATE STUDENT		
YES	32%	34%
NO	68	77
$X^2 = 8.59$	$P < .01$	
EXPANDED CO-OP TO NEW CURRICULUM AREAS		
YES	41%	34%
NO	59	66
$X^2 = 4.62$	$P < .05$	

REASONS FOR ATTENDING WORKSHOPS— LENGTH OF TIME IN CO-OP

	0-6 MONTHS	7 MONTHS- 1 YEAR	13 MONTHS- 3 YEARS	MORE THAN 3 YEARS	DID NOT WORK IN CO-OP
HISTORY OF CO-OP	48%	42%	34%	21%	41%
$X^2 = 40.70$			$P < .001$		
CONCEPT OF CO-OP	81%	75%	66%	44%	80%
$X^2 = 112.43$			$P < .001$		
PROFESSION SOCIETIES	40%	48%	44%	35%	34%
$X^2 = 12.46$			$P < .05$		
RELATIONSHIPS CO-OP TO CAREER EDUCATION	81%	88%	71%	66%	80%
$X^2 = 35.84$			$P < .001$		
ROLE OF CO-OP IN L.A.	64%	64%	54%	49%	68%
$X^2 = 22.84$			$P < .001$		
BENIFITS FOR EMPLOYEES	79%	82%	74%	73%	63%
$X^2 = 25.53$			$P < .001$		
MERITS FOR CO-OP MINORITIES	53%	58%	53%	44%	44%
$X^2 = 12.60$			$P < .001$		
ROLE OF COORDINATOR	87%	88%	82%	78%	81%
$X^2 = 12.12$			$P < .001$		
ROLE OF EMPLOYER	80%	83%	77%	70%	73%
$X^2 = 12.00$			$P < .001$		

REASONS FOR ATTENDING WORKSHOPS-- LENGTH OF TIME IN CO-OP (CONTINUED)

	0-6 MONTHS	7 MONTHS- 1 YEAR	13 MONTHS- 3 YEARS	MORE THAN 3 YEARS	DID NOT WORK IN CO-OP
PLANS NEW PROGRAM	84%	78%	67%	58%	79%
$X^2 = 55.71$			$P < .001$		
COST CO-OP	70%	61%	64%	66%	72%
$X^2 = 7.77$			$P < .05$		
ISSUES IMPLEMENTATION	77%	67%	66%	64%	71%
$X^2 = 14.93$			$P < .01$		
REQUIRE VIABLE PROGRAM	91%	84%	80%	70%	86%
$X^2 = 44.53$			$P < .001$		
SELL CO-OP TO ADMINISTRATION	55%	55%	55%	60%	36%
$X^2 = 29.40$			$P < .001$		
SELL CO-OP TO FACULTY	73%	67%	71%	70%	60%
$X^2 = 12.48$			$P < .05$		
PUBLIC RELATIONS TECHNIQUES	61%	62%	64%	64%	33%
$X^2 = 63.62$			$P < .001$		
RUN EFFECTIVE CO-OP OFFICE	68%	63%	65%	60%	42%
$X^2 = 46.68$			$P < .001$		
STUDENT RECRUITMENT	75%	76%	67%	64%	58%
$X^2 = 26.40$			$P < .001$		

REASONS FOR ATTENDING WORKSHOPS--
LENGTH OF TIME IN CO-OP (CONTINUED)

	0-6 MONTHS	7 MONTHS- 1 YEAR	13 MONTHS- 3 YEARS	MORE THAN 3 YEARS	DID NOT WORK IN CO-OP
STUDENT COUNSELING	74%	72%	67%	58%	63%
$X^2 = 17.77$			$P < .001$		
EVALUATE STUDENT LEARNING	71%	74%	71%	65%	64%
$X^2 = 7.21$			$P < .001$		
PROGRAM EVALUATION	78%	87%	79%	78%	72%
$X^2 = 14.79$			$P < .001$		
LEARNING CONTRACTS	59%	61%	54%	54%	48%
$X^2 = 8.83$			$P < .001$		
JOB DEVELOPMENT	66%	70%	73%	67%	46%
$X^2 = 44.74$			$P < .001$		
GRANT PROPOSAL	54%	52%	59%	54%	46%
$X^2 = 7.60$			$P < .001$		
CONTACT WITH CO-OP PEOPLE	86%	87%	91%	92%	81%
$X^2 = 15.14$			$P < .001$		

NON-PARTICIPANT

JOB TITLES

EMPLOYER OF CO-OP STUDENTS	26%
CO-OP EDUCATION DIRECTOR	21
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR	19
CO-OP EDUCATION COORDINATOR/COUNSELOR	10
TEACHING FACULTY	5
ALUMNI AND SENIOR PLACEMENT OFFICER	5
CO-OP/FACULTY MEMBER	4
COLLEGE PRESIDENT	2
CO-OP EDUCATION SUPPORT PERSONNEL	2
CAREER COUNSELOR	2
OTHER	2

LENGTH OF TIME IN CO-OP

0 - 6 MONTHS	2%
7 MONTHS - 1 YEAR	10
13 MONTHS - 3 YEARS	24
MORE THAN 3 YEARS	57
DID NOT/DO NOT WORK IN CO-OP	5

TYPE OF INSTITUTION

EMPLOYER	40%
SENIOR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	38
JUNIOR OR COMMUNITY COLLEGE	19
HIGH SCHOOL	2
OTHER	2

REASON HAVE NOT ATTENDED CO-OP TRAINING PROGRAM

RECEIVED ON-THE-JOB TRAINING--FELT NO NEED FOR FORMAL TRAINING	36%
UNABLE TO FIND WORKSHOP THAT DISCUSSED TOPICS INTERESTED IN	31
CO-OP EDUCATOR FOR MANY YEARS--NO NEED FOR FORMAL TRAINING	26
COST OF ATTENDING PROHIBITIVE	26
UNABLE TO FIND CONVENIENTLY LOCATED WORKSHOP	19
TRAINING PROGRAMS, IN GENERAL, DO NOT HELP PERSON TO DO JOB BETTER	10
WAS NOT AWARE THAT CO-OP TRAINING EXISTED	5

INFORMATION AND SKILLS--ON OWN

RELATIONSHIP OF CO-OP TO CAREER EDUCATION	64%
STUDENT COUNSELING	62
TECHNIQUES OF STUDENT RECRUITMENT	60
PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES/ORGANIZATIONS	59
SELLING CO-OP TO ADMINISTRATORS	56
MERITS OF CO-OP FOR MINORITY STUDENTS	55
ROLE OF CO-OP EMPLOYERS	53
PLANS AND GOALS FOR NEW PROGRAMS	53
RUNNING AN EFFICIENT CO-OP OFFICE	52

INFORMATION AND SKILLS--FROM CO-WORKERS

DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES TO EVALUATE STUDENTS	22%
DEVELOPMENT OF LEARNING CONTRACTS	21
CO-OP PROGRAM EVALUATION	20
ISSUES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION	19
BENEFITS OF CO-OP FOR EMPLOYERS	19
ROLE OF CO-OP COORDINATOR	18
ROLE OF CO-OP EMPLOYER	18
JOB DEVELOPMENT	18
CONCEPT OF CO-OP	17
MERITS OF CO-OP FOR MINORITY STUDENTS	17
TECHNIQUES OF STUDENT RECRUITMENT	17

INFORMATION AND SKILLS--FROM SUPERVISOR

CONCEPT OF CO-OP	21%
REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPING VIABLE PROGRAM	19
ROLE OF CO-OP COORDINATOR	18
ROLE OF CO-OP EMPLOYER	18
PLANS/GOALS OF NEW PROGRAM	18
COSTS OF CO-OP	17
CO-OP PROGRAM EVALUATION	16
MERITS OF CO-OP FOR MINORITY STUDENTS	15
ISSUES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION	15

TRAINING TOPICS—MOST IMPORTANT

CO-OP PROGRAM EVALUATION	69%
DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES TO EVALUATE LEARNING	64
BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYERS	62
ROLE OF EMPLOYER	62
REQUIREMENTS FOR DEVELOPING VIABLE PROGRAM	62
COST OF CO-OP PROGRAM	61
ROLE OF CO-OP COORDINATOR/DIRECTOR	60
MERITS OF CO-OP FOR MINORITY STUDENTS	59
ISSUES RELATED TO IMPLEMENTATION	58
RELATIONSHIP OF CO-OP TO CAREER EDUCATION	56

TRAINING TOPICS - LEAST IMPORTANT

Plans of new co-op program	38%
Job development	38
Running an efficient office	36
Selling co-op to top administrators	33
Selling co-op to faculty	33
Writing a grant proposal	19
History of co-op	17

FACULTY

JOB TITLE AT TIME OF WORKSHOP

EMPLOYER OF CO-OP STUDENTS	24%
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION DIRECTOR	22
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION COORDINATOR/COUNSELOR	15
COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR	14
TEACHING FACULTY	7
COLLEGE PRESIDENT	4
OTHER (I.E., STATE INTERNSHIP COORDINATOR, CO-OP EDUCATION RESEARCHER)	13

NUMBER OF YEARS IN CO-OP EDUCATION PRIOR TO THE WORKSHOP

MORE THAN FIVE YEARS	51%
ONE YEAR TO FIVE YEARS	28
LESS THAN A YEAR	4
I DO NOT/DID NOT WORK IN CO-OP	17

"LEAD TIME" GIVEN TO FACULTY

MORE THAN EIGHT WEEKS	35%
SIX TO SEVEN WEEKS	24
FOUR TO FIVE WEEKS	26
TWO TO THREE WEEKS	12
FEWER THAN TWO WEEKS	3

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN "LEAD TIME" AND HOW CLEARLY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT UNDERSTOOD

	VERY CLEARLY	ADEQUATELY
MORE THAN 8 WEEKS	46%	16%
6 TO 7 WEEKS	26	23
4 TO 5 WEEKS	20	34
2 TO 3 WEEKS	8	27

$X^2 = 22.86$ $P < .001$

INFORMATION RECEIVED PRIOR TO WORKSHOP

	YES	NO	DO NOT RECALL
Number of sessions responsible for	95%	3%	1%
Topic headings to be covered	90	6	4
Type of workshop audience	89	9	3
Length of sessions(s) to be taught	87	7	6
Objectives of the workshop	86	7	7
Instructional approach to be used	69	24	7
Size of workshop group	56	30	14
Travel arrangements	56	32	4
		(9% - not applicable)	
Living accommodations	56	28	4
		(12 % - not applicable)	
Specific description of content to be taught	54	33	13
Honoraria/consulting fees	48	40	6
		(6% - not applicable)	
Per diem	43	40	7
		(10% - not applicable)	

HOW CLEARLY ASSIGNMENT UNDERSTOOD

VERY CLEARLY	62%
ADEQUATELY	35
NOT CLEARLY AT ALL	3

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INFORMATION RECEIVED AND CLARITY OF ASSIGNMENT

		VERY CLEARLY	ADEQUATELY
INFORMATION RECEIVED ABOUT:			
TOPICS TO BE COVERED			
YES		96%	83%
NO/DO NOT RECALL		4	17
$X^2 = 11.153$	$P < .01$		
CONTENT TO BE TAUGHT			
YES		62%	42%
NO/DO NOT RECALL		38	58
$X^2 = 9.312$	$P < .01$		
NUMBER OF SESSIONS			
YES		99%	90%
NO/DO NOT RECALL		1	10
$X^2 = 9.533$	$P < .01$		
TYPE OF AUDIENCE			
YES		94%	84%
NO/DO NOT RECALL		6	16
$X^2 = 7.027$	$P < .01$		
SIZE OF GROUP			
YES		69%	37%
NO/DO NOT RECALL		31	63
$X^2 = 17.883$	$P < .001$		

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF WORKSHOP AND HOW CLEARLY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT UNDERSTOOD

	VERY CLEARLY	ADEQUATELY
EXCELLENT	32%	5%
VERY GOOD	61	38
GOOD	7	53
FAIR	--	3

$X^2 = 54.902$ $P < .001$

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES USED

DEMONSTRATION AND VISUAL AIDS	36%
GROUP PROJECTS	14
INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION	30
INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS	10
LARGE GROUP DISCUSSIONS	71
LECTURE (NO OPPORTUNITY FOR QUESTIONS)	6
LECTURE (WITH OPPORTUNITY FOR QUESTIONS)	87
ROLE PLAYING	7
SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION	36

SUBGROUPINGS UTILIZED

TWO YEAR AND FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS	33%
COLLEGE AND EMPLOYER REPRESENTATIVES	30
LARGE AND SMALL INSTITUTIONS	22
LIBERAL ARTS AND NON-LIBERAL ARTS CURRICULA	19
PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS	17
URBAN AND RURAL INSTITUTIONS	12

WORKSHOP LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

CLASSROOMS WELL VENTILATED	87%
CLASSROOMS SUITED FOR INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS	94
CLASSROOMS WELL LIGHTED	94
SEATING ARRANGEMENTS GOOD	88
FOOD GENERALLY GOOD	76
LIVING ACCOMMODATIONS SUITABLE	68
TRAINING STAFF HELPFUL	96
TRAINING STAFF FRIENDLY	97
SUFFICIENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR AFTER-SESSION ACTIVITIES	76
ENOUGH TIME TO ACCOMPLISH GOALS	84
TIME USED EFFICIENTLY	95
TIME FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTATION	75

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASSESSMENT OF WORKSHOP AND ASSESSMENT OF CO-OP TRAINING IN GENERAL

	Very Responsive	Moderately Responsive
Excellent	37%	10%
Very good	55	51
Good	8	36
Fair	--	3

$X^2 = 30.716$ $p < .001$

	Very Sound Information	Reasonably Sound Information
Excellent	36%	10%
Very good	51	55
Good	13	33
Fair	--	2

$X^2 = 22.248$ $p < .001$

	Very Clear	Reasonably Clear
Excellent	41%	12%
Very good	52	54
Good	6	31
Fair	--	3

$X^2 = 27.769$ $p < .001$

	Very Practical	Reasonably Practical
Excellent	35%	11
Very good	57	47
Good	8	39
Fair	--	4

$X^2 = 30.296$ $p < .001$

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASSESSMENT OF WORKSHOP AND ASSESSMENT OF CO-OP TRAINING IN GENERAL
(CONTINUED)

	Very Useful	Reasonably Useful
Excellent	36%	16%
Very good	61	47
Good	3	35
Fair	--	2

$X^2 = 25.841$ $p < .001$

EMPLOYER

TRAINING TOPICS EMPLOYERS RATE "VERY IMPORTANT"

	CEA	CED	
Selling co-op to top management	82%	64%	(6)
Role of student's supervisor	79	92	(1)
Concept of cooperative education	73	74	(2)
Use of co-op as recruitment device	72	67	(5)
Balance between student learning and job productivity	64	69	(3)
Student responsibility to employer	58	60	(7)
Role of employer in student evaluation	57	60	(8)
Student selection procedures	51	69	(4)
Cost of co-op for employer	38	39	(9)
Relation of co-op to Affirmative Action	38	39	(10)
Company benefits for co-ops	21	24	(12)
Salary level for co-ops	19	26	(11)
Legal aspects	15	14	(13)
Relation to labor union	9	6	(14)

REASONS FOR ATTENDING WORKSHOP - EMPLOYERS ONLY

Role of employer	92%
Benefit of co-op for employers	88
Contact with co-op people	77
Concept of co-op	72
Requirements for a viable program	72
Relationship of co-op to career education	69
Program evaluation	67
Issues of implementation	64
Role of co-op coordinator	63
Plans/goals of new program	62
Cost of co-op	60
Student recruitment	60
Merits of co-op for minority students	58

APPENDIX I

RESULTS OF TRAINING DIRECTOR INTERVIEWS

Cooperative Education Research Center
Northeastern University
Boston, MA 02115

"National Assessment of Cooperative Education Training"

Responses to Telephone Interviews with Training Directors

1a. How are training needs determined?

Response	Frequency of Response
From evaluations of past conferences, workshops	8
Trainers' best judgement	6
Advice from others:	
People who ask Training Center to put on workshop (i.e., co-sponsors)	10
Office of Education staff recommendations	3
People from Co-op Department at institution where Training Center located	2
Input from prospective participants	2
Co-op "leader", consultants	2
Talks, meetings with other training directors	2
Suggestions from National Commission for Cooperative Education	1
From research in the field	1

1b. What is the process of selecting topics and methods of presentation to meet these needs?

Topics

Response	Frequency of Response
Selected on basis of needs identified in (1a)	6
Selected according to requests/concerns of co-sponsors	5
Those that have proven valuable over time	3
Modified according to participant's needs	2
Pick broad, general topics	2
Form included with announcement on choice of topic	1
Ideas for topics from other workshops attended	1
Topics not as important as the leaders	1

Methods of Presentation

Response	Frequency of Response
Lecture	3
Audio-Video	2
Hand-outs	2
Panels	2
Up to consultants	2
"One-on-one" sessions	1
Discussions	1
Seminar	1
Depends on group size as well as content	1
Believes small group presentation better--there is over emphasis on lectures	1
For specific topics--have more active participation, smaller sessions	1
For broader topics--have presentations	1

2a. How are workshop faculty selected?

Response	Frequency of Response
Overall reputation, expertise of faculty	7
Topics--related expertise of faculty	5
Proven success in previous workshops	5
Faculty from convenient geographic region	4
Consultation with co-sponsors	3
Staff from training center's affliated college	2
Pool of consultants	2
Talk with other directors	1
Compatibility of consultants with nucleus group	1
Prefer those with broad, wide-ranging knowledge	1
"Big names" are not necessarily good faculty	1

2b. Do the same faculty teach the same topic each time a workshop is presented? If not, why is this so?

Response	Frequency of Response
No	7
Varies with needs/topics	2
Based on past evaluation, may find better faculty or keep some of the old ones	2
For sake of variety	1
Workshops regional, faculty vary with region	1
Like to try-out new people	1
Yes	1
Varies	5
Some faculty vary with regions, others do not	3
Not each time, but sometimes--depends on speaker's background, audience and topic	1
Does have a core of particular experts on certain topics and these do not vary much--rest does	1

3. How many full-time and part-time staff members do you have?

Response	Frequency of Response
All full-time	3
Full-time Director, full-time Co-Directors, full-time Co-op Assistants and consultants	1
Full-time Director, full-time Assistant to the Director	1
Full-time Director, full-time Secretary	1
No full-time	2
Part-time Director (15% of Director's time) and secretarial help as needed	1
(Part-time Director, part-time Assistant Director and instructors) no longer funded	1
Some full-time, Some part-time	10
Full-time Secretary, 3 part-time (including 30% of Director's time) and 3 consultants	1
Full-time Assistant Director, Part-time Director	1
(Full-time Director, Full-time Secretary, 15% Co-op Director) -no longer funded	1
1 Full-time Secretary, 2 Full-time Equivalents (including Director and Coordinator)	1
1 Full-time Faculty, 1 Full-time Secretary, ½ time others	1
Part-time Director (50%), Part-time Director (33%), Full-time Assistant Director, Full-time Secretary, Full-time Student, and Consultants, College faculty	1
5 Part-time (includes Director), 1 Full-time Graduate Student	1
3 Part-time (includes Director)	1
4 Part-time (includes Director)	1
1 Full-time Equivalents (2 Co-Directors), Full-time Secretary, and Consultants and College Staff	1

4. How is the mailing list developed, i.e., who are the potential workshop participants?

Response	Frequency of Response
Includes members of professional co-op societies	12
Professional Co-op Societies	
CEA	12
CED	4
SFEE	1
List of Colleges in region	7
In response to inquiries	6
Developed by co-sponsors	4
Professional organization (i.e., American Society of Trainers)	3
Chamber of Commerce lists	3
Former participants	3
Personal contacts	2
List of federally funded programs	2
Middle Atlantic Placement Association	2
Cooperative Education Research Center's list of President/ Directors	2
City/county school system lists	1
American Placement Council	1
College Placement Council	1
Former leadership	1
Small Business Administration	1
Lists from other training centers	1
Hotline recipients	1

5a. What criteria do you use to evaluate the success of your workshops?

Response	Frequency of Response
Written questionnaire at end of workshop	12
Follow-up survey at end of grant	1
Other co-op "outside experts" evaluate success of workshop	1
Leadership get together/discuss workshop	1
Participant reactions	1

5b. Do you conduct any post-workshop follow-up?

Response	Frequency of Response
Some letters sent out	4
Routine follow-up visit	3
When invited, conduct on-campus visit	2
Write to all attendees after workshop	2
Try to encourage co-sponsoring schools to contact employers	1
See how high school students applying to co-op school heard about co-op	1
Do follow-up consulting in person and by phone	1
Have pre-assessment visit, workshop, then follow-up	1
Feedback from consultants	1
Note the number asking to be added to mailing list	1
Note the number of walk-ins	1
Verbal feedback, call-backs	1
Workshop evaluated by co-sponsor	1
No	2

6. Which do you judge to be the most effective workshop(s) run by your Center?

Response	Frequency of Response
Specialized workshops--meet needs of particular group of participants.	6
Those for people new to co-op	5
All effective	2

Other comments

Workshops best when use a variety of presentation techniques.

Employer panels and student panels provide realistic and useful information to workshop participants.

Local support and leadership important to workshop success.

7. Which do you judge to be the least effective workshop(s) run by your Center?

Response	Frequency of Response
None viewed as "least effective".	3
Those where participants are experienced coordinators or directors	3
General workshops	2

Other comments

Learned from first workshop put on what makes a workshop a success or failure.

Need to have workshop leaders who understand their role correctly.

Importance of location of training programs.

8. Do you know if other training centers are offering the same or similar topics as you do? Do you try to avoid this? If so why and if not, why not?

Response	Frequency of Response
Yes--but do not worry about duplication because topics are not being repeated within the same geographic region	6
No--other centers do not offer same topics	5
Yes--try to avoid duplication of topics	4

9a. Is the present process of proposal writing and grant application adequate?

Response	Frequency of Response
No	6
Proposal review process not objective--if we use right "buzz" words get funded--no performance criteria--too vague	1
Concerned with high-volume coverage rather than results--orientation	1
Some readers very biased, may be better to have a task force determine training needs and have Centers contract to do training over a period of time, too unstable now to develop qualified staff	1
Should make grants for 3 year period with interim reports. Office of Education should have more weight.	1
Should move training programs into Colleges of Education to improve the quality of training. Participants should be evaluated, credentialed.	1
Criteria not clear. Arbitrary decision--making occurs and weakens program. Conflict exists between stated and real criteria. Is easy to deceive people in proposals. Readers not properly trained to read--are inconsistent---perhaps develop small core of trained readers.	1
Reader process not appropriate. Perhaps RFPs would work better. Personalize the grant application procedure.	1
Yes	5
Very much so	1
No problems	2
Mixed feelings	1
Mechanics are O.K. but there are inequities in the kinds of information given out by various individuals in Office of Education. Inconsistent interpretations. Multiple-year funding would be helpful as would training sesssions for readers. Need better guidelines on geographic area of training.	

9a. (continued)

Response	Frequency of Response
Unsure	2
Proposal writing is O.K. but reader process questionable--should have readers who know co-op.	

Summary of Primary Concerns

Reader process needs improvement	6
Funding criteria are unclear	3
Grants should be long term to ensure development of qualified training staff	3

9b. Would your training efforts cease or diminish considerably if federal support withdrawn?

Response	Frequency of Response
Diminish considerably	9
Perhaps down to 2/year	2
Limit geographic region of participants	1
More on consultant, phone advice, send information basis	1
Would try to secure other funds	1
College might absorb some costs	1
Cease	5
(Note: 2 already have)	
Too much hard work for not enough reward	1
Can't predict	1

10. Do you feel the federal government has set the direction of co-op training during the past few years? If so, how?

Response	Frequency of Response
Yes	9
Generally supportive of training. Doesn't know if specific directions set.	1
Very interested in large volume training. Centers are the same--just written to sound different. Feels a smaller group, service-oriented direction would be better.	1
By funding more training programs at a sacrifice of quality; criticism of some of the older established programs.	1
In the sense that people try to please the government--try to follow suggestions of government people.	1
Government has encouraged training for employees and faculty--but has not been restrictive.	1
Influence has decreased in past 2 years.	1
Post-facto direction set by their funding decisions. Have maintained same pattern of training through rewarding of established training center.	1
In an advisory capacity (make suggestions)--not to as great an extent as should. Have encouraged regionalization.	1
No	4
An amazing lack of direction--should be some Office of Education direction with help of those in co-op and training.	1
Northeastern University/University of South Florida have set direction in general. A few others have responded to special needs (i.e., minorities, employees). Hard to even get U.S. Office of Education involved in training.	1

10. (continued)

Response	Frequency of Response
No (continued)	
There are no criteria for quality control of training--government has not made any real concrete suggestions.	1
No broad/general direction--do set some direction by innuendo	1
Not sure	1

11. How have training needs changed over the past three or four years?

Summary of Most Frequent Comments

Response	Frequency of Response
Co-op people are more sophisticated and require new kinds of training	5
Training needs to be more specific (i.e., to needs of particular region, institution).	5

Doing lot of (too much) training of beginners--not enough for those who have been in co-op a number of years.

More need for sales techniques, co-op in liberal arts, career development; planning-organizing-evaluating programs.

People more concerned with issues in own geographic area and in own college.

With increased diversity in co-op--workshops must be more specific--meet individual needs.

Shorter and on-site workshops meet needs better.

Fewer black people seem to be attending--more women, more 2-year and more younger people involved. Workshops now are shorter--people want more "play time". It is harder to hold their attention.

Market has been saturated with general programs. Training must become more specific. Articulation between 2 and 4 year schools, employer sessions, local sessions.

Should have more sophisticated and knowledgeable people--training needs to be more mature.

Need to maintain enthusiasm of the experienced co-op person. Help coordinator gain new initiative, perhaps sensitivity training. Need to encourage presidential commitment, increase the support and involvement of the faculty--draw upon student learning from co-op in the classroom.

Don't know that they're changed at all.

Needs have not changed but desires of participants have changed as they have become more sophisticated at co-op.

Increased need for training of high school counselors.

Change from general to more highly specialized training sessions (i.e., for employers only, faculty only)

11. (continued)

Audience is more spohisticated and is looking for more in-depth understanding and knowledge. Now must meet the needs of practicing professionals and not just beginners (i.e., employer, sales, liberal arts, credit, 2 year college workshops)

Greater emphasis/involvement of community colleges. Need for employer understanding of co-op, fauclty training--how to work with coordinator, mobile training.

12a. What direction do you expect co-op training to take in the next five years? (assumes availability of federal money)

Summary of Most Frequent Comments

Response	Frequency of Response
More specialized	4
Evaluation/accreditation of co-op programs	4
Mobile training	3

Has been a lot of repetition--not much new. Feels credibility and evaluation area will be important. Accreditation of co-op programs.

In their geographic area co-op ed. is on the upswing (as is economy) thus there will be an increased need for training. Not sure how topics will change but thinks they will.

More assessment of programs.

(1) More co-op programs will include training within their own budget (symposium approach) (2) More mobile training will occur (3) Evaluation of programs will occur. Only larger established Centers like Northeastern University will attract.

Competency--learning on upswing--especially as a way to involve faculty. Use of objectives in the awarding of credit. Employer--educator meetings to discuss curriculum.

Fewer centers with larger and long-term grants.

Have Centers work with Research Center to keep up with facts and trends. Biannual meeting of training directors also would be helpful

Specialization

Move co-op into academic mainstream

Find more effective means of convincing employers to support co-op and presidents and deans to support co-op

Depends on whether co-op goes in the direction of experiential or classical education.

Hopes that regional training centers for high school guidance counselors can be set up (perhaps 10 or 12 throughout the country)

More centered on faculty and academic people; more specialized.

12a. (Continued)

(1) Regionalized centers to impart narrow bodies of information and knowledge adaptable to group presentations (i.e., sales, career counseling, proposal writing (2) Mobile training--understand and meet the needs of that institution. Have greater direct effort on trainee-trainer/evaluator role.

(1) Community college training (2) Mobile Training (3) Train top administrators (4) Retrain experienced employers (5) Liberal Arts (6) High School and Vocational School Counselors.

12b. Do you feel training should be specialized according to:

1. Geographic region?

Response	Frequency of Response
Yes	12
Training efforts should be coordinated to avoid duplication.	
Training efforts should be related to needs of geographic region.	
Training should be specialized but not limited-people should be invited from other areas too.	
Most cost-effective way to train.	
No	2
Limits the scope/audience of Centers with unique training program	

2. Topics?

Response	Frequency of Response
No	8
Topics are basically the same for most co-op people	
Yes	3

3. Type of audience?

Response	Frequency of Response
No	6
Yes	3

13. Additional comments

There is a need for federal funding to support training. New programs will be discouraged from beginning if there is no training for newcomers.

It might be helpful to have closer coordination among training directors.

Future must include more specific training to meet needs of specific schools.

Other aspects of training--such as resource tables, compiled bibliographies, responding to telephone/letter inquiries--are important too. Training staff also is involved in state co-op organization.

Workshop leadership should be the best available, even if it costs more to bring them in from distant locations. Readers need to be briefed on this type of cost concern as well as other aspects of training.

The following questions are of concern: How many participants should be involved in training programs? Should two and four college training be separate? Is joint sponsorship of training a good idea?

There is need for professionalism (quality-control) in training.

APPENDIX J

RESOURCES ON TRAINING

RESOURCES

American Society for Training and Development

Headquarters
P.O. Box 5307
Madison, WI 53705
(608) 274-3440

Washington, D.C. Office
One Dupont Circle, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 659-9588

Their publication, the Training and Development Journal, may be purchased through the Subscription Department at the main Headquarters.

BOOKS

Craig, Robert L., ed. Training and Development Handbook, A Guide to Human Resource Development, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976.

Davis, Larry Nolan, and McCallon, Earl. Planning • Conducting • Evaluating Workshops, A Practitioner's Guide to Adult Education. Austin, Texas: Learning Concepts, 1974.

Lynton, Rolf P., and Pareek, Udai. Training for Development. Homewood, Illinois: R.D. Irwin, 1967.

Pfeiffer, J. William, and Jones, John E., eds. A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training, Vol. I-VI. La Jolla, California: University Associates, Inc., 1977.

Suessmuth, Patrick. Ideas for Training Managers and Supervisors, Useful Suggestions, Activities, Instruments. La Jolla, California: University Associates, Inc., 1978.

Tracey, William R. Managing Training and Development Systems. New York: AMACOM, 1974.

Warren, Malcolm W. Training for Results. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1969.